LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA

Rittenhouse Press

UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

THE

Mercersburg Review;

AN ORGAN FOR

CHRISTOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL AND POSITIVE THEOLOGY.

EDITED BY

H. HARBAUGH, D.D..

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, MERCERSBURG, PA.

Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia in semet ipsum recapitulans.—IRENÆUS.

VOLUME XIV.—1867.

PHILADELPHIA:
S. R. FISHER & CO., 54 NORTH SIXTH STREET.

STORAGE
205
R255

hop

v. 14, 1867

.b.

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARIES

INDEX.

JANUARY NUMBER.

ARTICLE. PAGE.

I. Introductory Article, By the Editor. - - 5

II. Theology of the New Liturgy, - - - 23
By J. W. Nevin, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.

III. False Faith and Feeling in Regard to the Holy Ghost, By D. Gans, D. D., Norristown, Pa. - 67

IV. The Sacramental and Experimental in the Mystical Union, - - - - - - 86
By T. G. Appel, Ph. D., Mercersburg, Pa.

V. The Genius and Theology of St. Augustine, 98
By Philip Schaff, D. D., New York.

VI. Christian Patriotism, - - - - - 121
By Moses Kieffer, D. D., Tiffin, Ohio.

VII. God in History and in Science, - - 133
By L. H. Steiner, M. D., A. M., Frederick, Md.

VIII. Recent Publications, - - - - - 160

APRIL NUMBER.

I. The Christian Idea of Almsgiving, - - 165
By the Editor.

II. The Anti-Christ of Protestantism, - - 211
By E. E. Higbee, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa.

III. Our Open Door, - - - - - - 232
By Rev. G. B. Russell, A. M., Allegheny City, Pa.

IV. The German Reformed Church in America —Faith—Government—Worship, - - 249
By E. V. Gerhart, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.

V. Man and the Cosmos, - - - - 278
By Prof. Theodore Appel, A. M., Lancaster, Pa.

VI. The Two Systems, By the Editor. - - - 306

VII. Recent Publications, - - - - - 316

JULY NUMBER.

I. Apostolic Commission, - - - - - 325
By Rev. S. N. Callender, A. M., Greencastle, Pa.

II. The Humanity of Christ, - - - - - 352
By T. G. Apple, Ph. D., Mercersburg, Pa.

ARTICLE. PAGE.

III. The Word and Sacraments, - - - 366
By Rev. W. E. Krebs, A. M., Waynesboro', Pa.

IV. The Essence and the Form of Christianity, 383
By the Editor.

V. The Authority of the Church in the Interpretation of Scripture, - - - - 401
By T. S. Johnston, D. D., Lebanon, Pa.

VI. The Satanic Background in Redemption, 412
By Rev. S. H. Giesy, A. M., Philadelphia.

VII. Arianism, By J. W. Nevin, D. D., Lancaster, Pa. - 426

VIII. Athanasius, By J. W. Nevin, D. D., Lancaster, Pa., - 445

IX. Cornelius' Memorial, - - - - - 457
By Rev. W. M. Reily, Lewisburg, Pa.

X. The Personality and Divinity of the Holy Ghost, By D. Gans, D. D., Norristown, Pa. - - 464

XI. Recent Publications, - - - - - 475

OCTOBER NUMBER.

I. Commencement Address, - - - - 485
By J. W. Nevin, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.

II. English Literature and the Reformation, 508
By E. E. Higbee, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa.

III. Normal Humanity; or, Man in the Light of the Divine Idea, - - - - - 528
By Rev. S. H. Giesy, A. M., Philadelphia, Pa.

IV. National Literature, - - - - 564
By Rev. F. K. Levan, A. M., Mt. Pleasant, Pa.

V. Orphan Homes, - - - - - - 579
By Rev. G. B. Russell, A. M., Allegheny City, Pa.

VI. The Old Distinction Between "Gemeinde" and "Kirche," By the Editor. - - - 592

VII. Christ the Life of the World, - - 602
By Rev. I. E. Graeff, Lancaster, Pa.

VIII. Rationalistic Tendencies of Modern Theology, By Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D. D., Lancaster, Pa. 608

IX. Athanasian Creed, - - - - - 624
By J. W. Nevin, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.

X. Our Relations to Germany, - - - 627
By J. W. Nevin, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.

XI. False Interpretation, - - - - 633
By D. Gans, D. D., Norristown, Pa.

XII. Recent Publications, - - - - - 637

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1867.

INTRODUCTORY ARTICLE.

The publication, which was from 1849 to 1852 the "Mercersburg Review," from 1853 to 1856 the "Mercersburg Quarterly," from 1857 to 1861 again the "Mercersburg Review," but which, under these changes of title, steadily maintained the same spirit and character, and which has been, during the last five years, suspended, is now again resumed. Its suspension was not owing to any loss of interest in the subjects to which its discussions had been devoted, but partly, if not wholly, to the pressure on all publishing interests brought on by the war for the Union, and was always designed to be but temporary.

The reasons which led to its origination are the reasons for its continuance. In resuming the old name, it proposes to lift the old banner. It adopts anew the language of the introductory article of the first number, January, 1849: "The Review is expected to bear a distinctive and peculiar character. As the mere echo of what already exists in this way, it would have no right to challenge any regard. It proposes to represent, in philosophy and religion, the system of thinking which has come to be identified extensively, in this country, with the Institutions at Mercersburg, though of far wider and higher force, in fact, on both sides of the Atlantic. With the same field of survey that is spread out to other Theological Reviews, the stand-point of its observations will be materially different. It

is wished in this respect to supply, by means of it, a want, which all other Reviews at the present time fail to supply."

By this, it was designed only to say, that other Reviews have proposed to themselves a mission and work, in the prosecution of which that particular field of theological and philosophical inquiry which is deemed of the very first and highest importance, is either left wholly out of view, or is permitted to occupy a merely subordinate place. This, in a measure at least, is held to be still true. Without designing to revive the memory of those somewhat impatient, if not carnal polemics, which, during the first theological panic, were waged against what was by its enemies, with unfriendly intent, baptized as "Mercersburg Theology," due respect to the truth and the progress of history requires us to recall the fact, that, in its early heroic period, it stood alone against the combined host of what claimed the right to stand, unquestioned and unassailed, as the *ne plus ultra* of American Protestant and Evangelical orthodoxy. It was held forth in horror, as being at deadly war with the Protestant principle; as essentially Romanizing in its tendency; and as a Jesuitical betrayal of the interests of Evangelical Christianity. Its advocates were publicly read out of the Protestant theological synagogue; and the German Reformed Church, which, from conviction of the deep and solemn interest which it vindicated, as well as from an instinctive and traditional sense that it was bringing to view again old and anointed truth, opened to it a bosom of sympathy and protection, was, by public synodical acts, excluded from the general Diet of the leading denominations of the land. Ministers, who had entered the service of the Church from abroad without a change of their former theological genius or views of cultus and practical Christianity, violently assailed the mother which had adopted them. The storm was fierce and loud; and though our little ark swung fearfully, it at the same time swung proudly, upon the waves, and was never suffered to be borne away from its sure anchorage.

The theology which passed through this ordeal was never for a moment shaken from its foundations. Its friends not only

continued to hold it firmly, but have steadily grown in the assurance and love of it. Besides, it has entered into the very life of the German Reformed Church; and while its principles and tendencies have, from time to time, and in various ways, met the approval and received the fostering care of its highest judicatories, it has manifested itself in its bosom, and throughout its entire Christian life, as a practical power, producing the most satisfactory and desirable fruits. It has given a higher character to all its activities, and infused a more vigorous and beautiful spirit into its practical teachings, its government, its pastoral work, and its family life.

In fuller possession now of the precious inheritance it has brought to us, we have no disposition to think uncharitably of the assaults it has endured. On the contrary, in the more tranquil present, we call to mind, with a more grateful sense of good received, the storms which have shaken this growing cedar, only that its roots might strike more deeply and firmly into the soil. May not this chapter of history also be commended to the attention of all such as feel themselves called upon to contend for the faith, that they may learn from it how utterly vain are all polemics, which have not also in view those irenics which are always and only found to lie in a deeper appreciation of the truth under discussion. What we go out to fight against, may not merely be only a wind-mill; it may also be a true friend, whom, if we are patient enough to know better, we may not wish to fight at all.

In many respects, a great change has come over the theological mind of this country since the first issue of the Review in 1849. The same utterances, which at that time caused alarm and opposition, do not now awaken the same prompt and fiery jealousy. The tyrannical power of short and narrow traditions has been greatly broken, and there is a far greater disposition, if not to examine, still to tolerate views which are not in the exact line of hereditary orthodoxy. This is simply a fact which lies open to common observation. The reason of it some might be disposed to find in a spirit of theological indifference, of which there is no doubt more than enough in the land. We

would rather attribute it to a more honorable origin. The earnest catholic spirit of German theological investigation has, in the last ten or fifteen years, been largely infused into the English and American theological mind. The master works of German evangelical divines have, to some extent, been studied in the original, and in a still larger degree become known by means of translations into the English language. It is not too much to say, that the prevailing theological literature of the present day consists in translations of German works, or in original English works, suggested, animated and enriched from the vigorous sources of German thought. So well is this fact known, that it is not even necessary to refer to the many classic German works, which have already been completely domiciliated in our American theological world. No scholar could for a moment think of going back to live in the time, when these stimulating works for him did not exist. Beyond what any one could tell, has our American theology been enriched and stimulated from German sources. The depth, the catholicity, the generous large-heartedness of these giant German divines have served effectually to shame and banish the narrow, short and slavish traditions, which had bound men's minds to some sectional phase of Christianity, and have called them out of the dark caves of frozen bigotry into the genial sunshine of catholic truth. Men have discovered that there are other things in Germany besides rationalism, mysticism, pantheism and transcendental nonsense, and seem determined to take a kind of holy revenge upon their former deceptions, by showing themselves in the very front ranks of those, who are doing homage to precious and indispensable truth.

Besides, it has been discovered by the most earnest and wakeful theologians in the land, that the ghosts of that very rationalism, which they had thought had taken full and everlasting possession of Germany, but which has, in fact, been overcome and mortally wounded there by the triumph of evangelical thought, are starting up and around them in our own country, well armed and strong in the stolen armor of German error and German learning. The very error which they vainly

believed was still entrenched in the strongholds of German universities, always quick and insinuating, had stolen a march across the water, and "while men slept," was sowing its tares over the land. Awakened as out of a dream by the pleasant voice, without suspecting danger, they found themselves listening to the new evangel of enlightenment, which was flourishing its bright and bewildering originalities around them. Though warned that these very originalities were the very self-same old foes, which the revived German theology had spewed out of its mouth, they ceased not to welcome them as a refreshment of their own theology, and to incorporate them as an enrichment of their faith! In this way rationalism was mingling its deadly virus with the very life-blood of our American popular theology. The transfer, by means of the translation of German evangelical works to our soil and language, has assured all who have a wish to know, that rationalism has, in fact, already opened its warfare against the truth in the American Church. The presence of the antidote serves as the means of detecting the poison.

It involves no immodesty to state, what is simply a historical fact, that, in the discovery of the threatening danger to our American Church-life from imported rationalism, as well as in the appreciation of German theology, in its later revived strength and force as furnishing the true remedy for the insidious evil, Mercersburg Theology was first in the field. Nor need we hesitate to claim for it this honor, that, for the precious truth involved, it was ready to suffer persecution, and even patiently to submit to temporary exile from the sympathies of the theological world.

The Mercersburg Review, from the beginning, labored to remove the mask from the Protean spirit of rationalism, turning up as it did, like the Wandering Jew, in every section of American popular theology, and in various forms of practical religion. This was the front of its offence. It was attacking what had, in fact, become the gods of the religious mind. The principle from which and with which it assailed this system of error, is embodied in the well-known motto which the Review

adopted from Anselm: *Neque enim quæro intelligere ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam.* In holding that faith precedes knowledge, it did not for a moment allow either that faith and knowledge were antagonistic to each other, or that they should be divorced from one another. The Review held, that our common American theology had sought, so to reduce the divine mysteries of faith, as to bring them fully to the level of the natural reason, and thus to make reason and the natural common sense of men the measure of revealed truth. This view had, in fact, popularized itself in the common religious mind; and hence men everywhere were heard to say, that they "would not and could not believe what they did not understand." This common sentiment, first created by rationalistic theories in disguise, proclaimed from the pulpit, and the chair of theological professors, demanded in turn that religious truth should be preached according to this rule. The people would hear no more of mysteries in Christianity. It must all be capable of being understood. It must, therefore, be brought down from its high supernatural character into the sphere of the natural, in order to bring it within the grasp of the natural mind. The very motto of the Rationalists was, in substance, adopted: *Klahrheit ist Wahrheit!* Make it clear to us; bring it down to our reason, so that we can intellectually take it all in, and then we will believe it. What you cannot make plain to the mind is not truth, but error, or at least superstition.

Here was work for this sort of divines, and a stern demand for a new sort of divinity—one, too, which was not provided for in the reigning Protestant formularies, but at bottom irreconcilably antagonistic to them. In them, as well as in the purer traditions of all the leading Protestant denominations, the supernatural, the mystical elements of Christianity were clearly acknowledged. The Church, the ministry, the sacraments, by reason of their union with the divine-human life of Christ, still stood as embodiments of objective supernatural power and grace, demanding faith as the primary organ for the apprehension and appropriation of their gracious contents. But the people do not want mysteries—they have been in-

structed not to want them—they have been told that to want them is to have a tendency that will lead to Rome. What is to be done? These old formularies of the Protestant faith must be illuminated by a new light. This must come from the stand-point of the human understanding. All that does not fall within the range of its capacity must be swept away, as the cobweb gatherings of superstitious ages!

This process of this reformation, by which *Wahrheit* was to be reduced to the level of *Klahrheit*, though it manifested itself in various phases, and was in its very nature unscientific, may yet be traced by a certain kind of order. It runs something like this: The Person of Christ has not *directly* much, if any thing, to do with human salvation, but the Incarnation is important chiefly, if not only, as a means to an end. What Christ *is* may be a proper subject for curious speculation, but it is not a practical dogma. What He *did*—some went farther and said, what He *taught*—this only is of vital moment. The atonement is not a real *at-one-ment* of God and man, effected primarily in the union of the divine and human natures in the Person of Christ, but a judicial *arrangement* effected in the divine mind, to be carried out, not by what Christ *became*, but by what He *did* and *taught* alone. Thus, the work of redemption was at once effectually severed from the Person of Christ, and the mysterious bond, which unites the divine and human in and from His person, was broken. With the sundering of this conjunction, the whole system of redemption was cut off from its divine-human head, and with the collapse the whole order of supernatural mysteries sunk down into the sphere of the human will, the human understanding; and though the divine will and the divine mind were still supposed to operate upon the human will and the human mind, yet this was not in the way of the union of the divine and human, but only in the way of spiritual, moral, and intellectual forces brought to bear upon the spiritual, moral, and intellectual nature of men.

Thus the organic connection of the divine and human is broken. Here is the heresy of all heresies! This is that primal, fundamental lie, after which there can be no truth.

Though men may still regard Christ to be the *light*, they cannot hold Him to be the *life* of men. They reverse that deep word: "In Him was life; and the life was the light of men," so as to read: "In Him was light; and the light was the life of men." From light to life—from the mind to the will—from the understanding to faith—this, this is rationalism; and was it not, is it not still the principle of our ruling, popular theology?

But now, when you thus disjoin the divine and the human in the person of Christ, or ignore it as lying at the base of salvation, what character have you for the Church, as His body? It becomes, of course, a *society* produced by its members. It is no longer an organism, having for its generic principle the divine-human life of Christ mediated to us by the Holy Ghost; but only a confederation of spiritual, moral and intellectual sympathies and agreements. Then, too, the sacraments of the Church, being in no real and mystical union with the divine-human life of Christ by the Holy Ghost, are no media of that life to believing recipients, but only monumental, symbolical modes of teaching tests of obedience, or at best, mere signs and assurances of grace otherwise, and at other times, received.

Thus, by this rationalistic spirit, are all the sublime mysteries of faith, which can exist only for faith, and, by beholding which with reverence, the understanding is itself to be drawn up into that true light which alone can enlighten it, dragged down to the profane level of the natural reason, to be snuffled at by men, who, because they disown faith as the absolute condition of divine knowledge, have neither taste nor organ for the truth. Against this formidable spirit of error Mercersburg Theology, through its organ, the Review, went out like David against Goliah. It said, It is the old enemy which has been defeated and wounded across the waters, but is now trying to recover his lost fortunes on the soil of the New World! We know his protean face. Though he talks piously, pretends even to superior spirituality, and tries to say Shibboleth, he really ever says Sibboleth, "for he cannot frame to pronounce it right." Though strongly entrenched, not only in the theological, but also in the common religious mind of the land, his host gave signs of panic

and alarm before that advancing banner, which at once served to reveal his true character, and also to show him humble but firm defiance, by its accompanying watchword: "*Neque enim quæro intelligere ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam.*"

Standing before this "lay of the land," Mercersburg Theology necessarily at first assumed a negating attitude, according to the order of its own motto, where the negative is, in order, before the positive. It denied that the prevailing rationalism, however sugar-coated, was truly Protestant truth, or, in fact, truth of any other kind. It showed its inconsistencies, set forth its deviations from older and better Protestantism, pointed out its necessary downward and destructive tendencies, and challenged its friends to maintain it either on theological, historical or symbolical grounds. The substance of the defence from the other side was: "You are going to Rome;" to which the reply was ever returned, in substance: "We think not; but suppose even we are, how does that prove that you are not going into rationalism, disintegration and destruction?"

Though the first assault was necessarily thus negatively made, the controversy was by no means maintained on purely negative ground. The other, the positive side of the Anselmic motto, was also brought out: I believe that I may know. Believe what? Believe in the supernatural facts of redemption. Hence, the Review brought forward from time to time the Creed with its supernatural facts—the Person of Christ, the Incarnation, the objective supernatural character of the Church and its sacraments. On this positive ground the Review placed itself, and there, as behind impregnable bulwarks which had stood through the ages, and against which all manner of heresies had dashed only to be broken, it not only maintained its ground, but achieved signal advantages against its enemies.

Though the stand-point of the Review has thus always covered the positive as well as the negative side, as these are both included in its motto, yet the great progress which it has effected, not only in the bosom of the Reformed Church, but also in some directions beyond its bounds, warrants us in now formally assuming a new point of observation. By means of a

new motto, we propose to shift the stand-point from the partly negative, and wholly anthropological old motto, over into the positive Christological heart of the grand mystery of redemption. As the stand-point which our new motto furnishes lies deeper toward the heart of the sublime mystery, so it originates farther back in the history of the Church. Possessing our faith with the full sense of the grand Anselmic words, we are prepared to go farther back to hear still greater words of confession from the mouth of Irenæus, involving in them, as they do, the centre of all centres, the principle of all principles, the mystery of all mysteries, and the faith of all faiths: UNUS CHRISTUS JESUS DOMINUS NOSTER VENIENS PER UNIVERSAM DISPOSITIONEM, ET OMNIA IN SEMET RECAPITULANS.

As this is with Irenæus a central idea, so it is a favorite one, which he brings up again and again.* It is, in substance, the Pauline idea, and based on Eph. i. 10; where we are told that it was "the mystery of God's will," that Jesus Christ should come in due time, that "He might gather together in one (*ἀναχεφαλαιώσασθαι*—lead all things back to their beginning, re-head them in Himself, and so renew and restore them all in full union and harmony with Himself and with themselves) all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in Him." According to this teaching of St. Paul, and of our motto from Irenæus, there is only one principle of unity for all things—Jesus Christ; in His Incarnation He came, not violently and abruptly into the universal order of created things, but in harmony with, and according to the original aptitudes and determinations of all things; and as the catastrophe of the Fall had broken all things away from their true original head and unity, He gathered back and re-headed all things in Himself, that so He might renew, harmonize and restore all. With Him, as with St. Paul, the expression "all things" is to be taken in its widest sense as comprehending all things, "both which are in heaven, and which are on earth."

---

*1. See Duncker: Des heiligen Irenæus Christologie, &c., p. 157—262.
Also, Dorner's His. of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ.

Dr. Schenkel, in his commentary on Ephesians, in 1862, has given the sense of this passage, and so of our motto, beautifully and truly (Would he stand by it now?): "Sin has not merely disordered man, but also thrown the world into confusion, and especially given over the earth, which was to be cultivated and inhabited by man (Gen. ii. 15), to ruin and desolation. Christ, on the other hand, has transplanted anew into the world, and especially in the earth, the fulness of heavenly powers and divine gifts of grace; all that is in the earth is to be evermore inwardly permeated by the same; and as He Himself, according to the nature-side of His personal life is from the earth, and developed Himself in an earthly, natural way, He has just in this very way comprehended in His person both the heavenly and the earthly element, and this in all their references and relations, and is thus not only the reconciler of humanity with God, but also the mediator of heaven and earth, the restorer of that world-harmony which God originally designed should exist." With this agree the words of Dr. Harless, which Schenkel also quotes: "Herein consists the great significance of the atonement, that it is not merely a restoration of life on earth, but a bringing back again of the harmony of the universe."

We are not the less pleased with our motto, when we call to mind the fact, that it reflects so beautifully and truly the characteristic of the life of its author. His name itself speaks of peace and conciliation. Besides, belonging by birth to the Eastern, and as to the sphere of his greatest labors, to the Western Church, and standing alike above the restless freedom of the orient and the stiff bondage of the occident, he was ever the mediator of its differences. Moved not only by a penetrating mind, but still more by the deepest intuitions of the Christian life, he ever seized upon that fundamental principle of unity, toward which he made all the different tendencies converge, bringing them into harmonious reconciliation in central, impenal-Christological truth.

Our Review aims at the same thing. Amid the distractions and disintegrating tendencies of the age, it proposes to work

for conciliation and unity. Even its polemics mean irenics. Though, like our divine Master, it bring a sword, it is a sword that shall strike for peace. Its holy ambition is to aim at "conquering a peace" by overturning, as far as lies in its power, every theological scheme and tradition, which builds on any ground short of the one, only, and absolute centre of unity—the Christological principle of theology. We have heard enough of unity to be comprehended in, and to be secured by, iron bands of ecclesiastical polity—unity that is to be the result of compression. We have also seen the failure of all vain endeavors to convey and hold the entire life of Christendom in one or another anthropological centre. We have seen the disappointed hopes of those, who have thought that the principle of unity inheres in some powerful momentum of what is called practical religion. Can we hope to find any better solution in the latest endeavors of sympathetic union platform confederations? Divided Christendom will own the power of no such magnets. We must go back of all this. We are divided, because our theologies have lost the one, only central and absolute principle. Theology got us wrong; theology must get us right. Our theologies are wrong, because they do not start in the one, only principle. Just as soon as our theologies have been re-headed in Christology, will all our ecclesiastical differences adjust themselves into unity. The axiom, "things that are near the same thing are near each other," is not truer than the fact, that Christendom will be united in proportion as it derives all its dogmas from the one Incarnate Word, the Word of all words, the Dogma of all dogmas.

When we once show ourselves solemnly in earnest with the great central fact announced by St. Paul in the passage referred to, as well as elsewhere in his Epistles, and which is so comprehensively set forth in our motto, how can we fail to see that every part and department of theology must have its organic head and principle in the mystery of the God-man. Yea, not only theology proper, but literally "all things"—all science and all history, can have their true character, their true unity,

and their true meaning for us, only as viewed in their relation to Him.

Hence Christological Theology must be historical. It is historically unfolded, and can only be rightly apprehended in connection with that history, which its own principle has created, determined, and conditioned. No error can be greater than to regard the central mystery of the Incarnation as an abrupt and unmediated event—coming down into the world's history by sudden, brilliant crash, as a meteor falls from the sky upon the dull earth! Not only were all things originally created in Him, by Him, and for Him, but He came in and through the aptitudes and needs of all things for Him. He came, as Irenæus has it, *per universam dispositionem.* The human is essentially related to the divine; and hence His actual coming is not merely *to* it, but *in* it. Hence, He comes not abruptly down into the race at Bethlehem, but He comes through the history of Judaism. Moreover, very inadequate is that view, which regards His coming through Judaism, as a coming merely through promise, law, and prophecy—or, as Dr. Lange says, a "coming through the Old Testament books." Those Books are themselves books of life, only because there underlies them a life of books. In a word, His deepest, truest, and most real coming through the Old Testament is a coming in flesh and blood—a coming through and in generations—a coming in history; not in the events of history merely, but in that human life in which lay, and from which operated, the life of history. Yea, more. If we acknowledge, as all Christian historians do, that the Incarnation is even premediated in heathenism, we are in like manner impelled to escape the subtle deception, into which the mind so naturally falls, that this same prevening heathen history could have such a relation to the Incarnation, if the eternal Logos had not such aptitude for the human, as that His own life should also be in some kind of underlying and underacting communion with the life, of whose activities this heathen-prophetic history is the creation and result.

If such be the relation of the life of the Logos to human life and history previous to His actual Incarnation, how infinitely

deeper and more certain must be that relation, after He has actually entered the human in a personal way, and so joined His own divine-human life with the life and history of the race! Let us not deceive our own minds by separating history from life. Christian history, the history of Christianity, is the coming of Christ; but He does not come in it through creeds, books, records, polity, but as life underlying all these. What we see in the history of Christianity is not a mere impelling and repelling of abstract truth and abstract error; it is not a war of mind, carried on by moral and intellectual forces, by means of abstract truth. It is all these set in motion by the underlying divine-human life. There is, in fact, no abstract Christian truth. It is concrete. Jesus Christ is the truth. In Him is life; and that life is the light of men. There is no other conception of truth in the New Testament. Truth is no fancy, no notion, no opinion, no doctrine, but a dogma, an objective fact and principle, a life. The ultimate, absolute, one primal truth, the dogma of all dogmas, the fact of all facts, the truth of all truth, the life of all life, is the God-man. The truth, as apprehended and re-presented by the human consciousness, does indeed enter into history, but this ever only as it is the manifestation of individual and general human life; but all this is dependent upon that life which proceeds from the God-man as the individuality of all individualities—the *whole* of the *all*—the generic and general new life of the redeemed and renewed race.

Thus, as all dogmas rest in facts, and facts in life, all dogmas must be the development and manifestation of life. But life is, in its very nature, that which possesses its own future in germ, and thus requires for its own manifestation and completion a process in time, and is thus essentially historical. Who can study the history of Christianity with open eyes, and yet not discern that life, dogmas, and history are one thing? Who can fail to see that dogmas are the products of life, and that history is the product of dogmas? The history of dogmas is the highest character of history. It presents those results, toward which all the movements in Church History ever tend, and in which all

its processes find their completion and their end. Thus Church History ends in showing how the dogma was produced, and the tracing of the history of dogmas has to do with the ever-successive results of history. Then, of course, this same history of dogmas must necessarily lie at the very foundation of all right dogmatic Theology. He who has not studied the history of dogmas, has no more right to be heard in theology, than he who drops into a court-house after the history of the case has been brought out in the evidence, has a right to sit with the jury as one who has a call to give judgment in the decision of the case. It is humiliating, that no where but in theology is such presumption and absurdity tolerated with patience. When, we earnestly ask, is such vain and wicked pretense to come to an end?

Christological Theology, as we have now shown, must be historical; but because it is both these, it must be positive. By this we do not mean positive as opposed to negative. This is, of course, included in the idea of positive, but it settles no principle. He who denies, is as positive as he who affirms; they only occupy different stand-points. To assert from one's self is not to be positive, but to *place one's self on something* (*pono*, *positivus*), and in the strength of that position to assert. To assert from one's self may be, and often is, positive impudence or positive arrogance, but can never be positive theology. From what we have said of the weight and force, which must be given to the historical, it may easily be seen, that where this is ignored all positivism must be just of this evil character. Hence, it is generally found, that those who regard themselves as the highest authority for the truth of what they teach, and care least for placing themselves on any authority beyond themselves, are likely to be most positive in the sense of self-assertion. A bubble bobs up on the surface of a wide, powerfully-flowing stream, imagines itself an *eye* that can see all things, and a *dome* that is spanning the whole world, and at once undertakes, not only the guidance of the whole stream which bears it, but the protection of the interests of the whole world! Foolish bubble. But not more assuming than he, who starts up at some point in the mighty onward sweep of Christian history,

and proposes, by a positivism that has its authority in himself, to set right, if not even start anew, the history of the world! He who would move the world, cannot be thus himself both fulcrum and lever. Traditions, which a man thus selfishly spins out of himself, are the worst of all traditions. They are short and brittle as shoddy-wool, and it will be but a short theological campaign that the armor he weaves out of them will endure. Not this miserable self-assertion is positive theology.

Positive theology places itself upon the *objective* facts and truths of the Christian system. It accepts the dogmas which historical Christianity brings to it. It first confesses the truth, and then illustrates and teaches what it confesses. It holds objective, historical truth to be surer than subjective notions and opinions. It looks upon the general as the true bosom of firmness and rest to the individual. By this self-surrender to the objective, general, historical, it does not make itself a negation and a nothing; but, on the contrary, it is positive just because it has position. It is firm because its faith has objective contents. It is strong because it stands in strength. It can grow because it is planted in the soil.

Moreover, the truly positive involves the truly practical. We know the popular cry, that the objective dogma is not only an unnecessary thing in practical Christianity, but that it is generally a hinderance to its healthy and vigorous activities, and in most of cases proves a trap or a snare. Hence, according to the modern theory, it is held that the highest and most successful movements in the direction of practical Christianity require, that each denomination of Christians shall ignore and forget those very points on which it primarily stands, as a denomination, separate from others, before it can take effectual part in the true work of practical Christianity. It is said, we know, that what is thus required to be ignored, are only non-essentials. But what are essentials, if they are not those doctrines, on which they separated and on which they now stand apart? But these they are now to ignore! The fact is, what they are called upon to forget on these practical platforms, are, by their own highest and most solemn testimony, essentials;

and what they unite in are non-essentials. And this is a preparation for the high and solemn work of practical religion! Can an error be more subversive of all true Christian life than this?

The theology which this Review represents has no sympathy with such views of practical Christianity. It claims for itself a high practical character, because it is ruled throughout by the Christological, historical, and positive element. This, as we have shown, is the very current in which the Christian life flows. The life of Christ, apprehending and impelling our human life as by all the force of history, and thus giving us ever a firm and sure foundation in the present—this life is itself practical Christianity of the highest and truest type. We claim for this type of theology a deeply solemn and earnest practical character; and we promise that our contributors will, in due time, make it appear, that this claim is abundantly sustained, by an exhibition of the practical life, in which it has actualized and commended its salutary power in the bosom of the Reformed Church in this country.

Having thus plainly and honestly set forth, in a general way, the aims and purposes of this Review, we close this Introductory Article by giving a brief recapitulation of the whole in the language of our prospectus, which, as it will necessarily fall away with the cover, we desire here to preserve. It contains, at the same time, points that it is designed to bring out in its discussions, which are not specially elaborated in this article.

The earnest questions which the Mercersburg Review so vigorously discussed in former years, are neither fully settled nor out of the way, and new allied issues are pressing upon the Church from all sides. It is felt, therefore, that its work is not yet done; and hence, resuming the old title, it is, at the same time, designed that this Review shall be, as far as possible, in character, life, and spirit, a continuation of the old Mercersburg Review.

The design of the Review is the development of Christological, Historical, and Positive Theology; and to labor in the sphere of general science and literature only so far as these are

necessarily related to, and must be moulded by the science of sciences. Its pattern is the venerable Apostles' Creed. With the Creed the Review regards Jesus Christ as the Central Revealer of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity; the true and ultimate principle of all revelation; the new Head and Life of humanity restored in His Person, and to be glorified in Him by the Holy Ghost; the central principle of Christianity, and the fundamental basis of the Church, which is His Body. Hence, it holds all Theology to be primarily Christological; and, because Christological, also Historical; and, because both these, truly Positive.

On the same ground, and for the same reason, the Review will be Catholic, claiming a title to the Theological treasures of all ages.

The Review appreciates, at the same time, the historical, theological, and practical necessity of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and is, therefore, Protestant. It proposes, also, to make due account of the revival and advancement of theology, during the last quarter of a century, in Protestant Germany, the depth and wealth of which deserve the honor and gratitude of entire Christendom, as having effected a decisive victory over the boldest and profoundest forms of unbelief.

With these more general interests in view, the Review will not fail to give due attention to the more special department of Reformed Theology, both in its historical aspect, as reaching back to the Reformation, and in its present status as being still, as all living theology ever must be, in a process of development under the type peculiar, especially to the German branch of the Reformed Church of this country.

The Review will, moreover, steadily hold forth the fact, that the Theology by which the German branch of the Reformed Church of America, in its latest tendencies, is apprehended and carried forward, is not based on mere abstract speculation, but rather on the primal facts and the everlasting verities of Christianity; and it will aim at unfolding the deeply solemn character and tendencies of this type of theology.

Finally, while this Review proposes to abate nothing of what is due to the scientific and classic form properly belonging to a Theological Review, it will endeavor, as far as possible, to meet and satisfy the needs of an intelligent, earnest, and inquiring laity.

Art. II.—THEOLOGY OF THE NEW LITURGY.

BY JOHN W. NEVIN, D.D.,
President of Franklin and Marshall, College, Lancaster, Pa.

The discussion on the Revised Liturgy, at the meeting of the late General Synod in Dayton, brought out clearly two things. It showed that the liturgical question, as it now has place among us in the Reformed Church, is in truth a doctrinal question of the deepest significance; and it showed also that as a doctrinal question it has to do, not with one or two points of theological opinion simply, but with theology in its universal view.

This accounts for the earnestness with which the Liturgy is opposed by those who have set themselves against it. To some it has no doubt appeared strange, that the book should have become an object of such strong jealousy and dislike. For by general confession now, we are a liturgical branch of the Church; we allow the propriety of prescribed forms of worship; we hold it part of our Reformed right to use them, or not to use them, as to our congregations severally may seem best. In conformity with this freedom, we have been willing to let liturgies take their course among us heretofore, with little or no attempt at anything like ecclesiastical supervision or restraint. Our ministers might use the old Palatinate Liturgy, or some irresponsible compilation handed down from the last century, or the Mayer Liturgy, or any other Liturgy they pleased; nobody felt called upon to interfere; all were willing to let ministers and people judge for themselves what sort of service might best answer their wants. But in the case of our new Liturgy, all this tolerant indifference has suddenly come

to an end. Even in its first imperfect form, as the Provisional Liturgy, the broad sanction of the Church, under which it appeared, was not sufficient to protect it from violent obloquy and assault. Pains were taken to create prejudice against it on all sides; it could not be introduced, it was said, among our people; and yet, strangely enough, its influence was deprecated with ominous apprehension, as likely to work mischief far and wide. As the Revised Liturgy, it is now relieved of its first defects, and brought into easy working form. But this has only drawn upon it more apprehensive jealousy, and more active opposition, than what it had to encounter before. Hence the onset made upon it at Dayton. That was the culmination of a movement, which looked to nothing less than the violent suppression of the new Order of Worship before it was fairly presented to the churches. The churches, it was still said, could never be brought to receive it; but it was held dangerous, now more than before, to give them the opportunity of deciding that point for themselves. Not only must the book not be formally allowed; it must be formally condemned and prohibited from use. The usual congregational liberty of the Reformed Church must here come to an end. For this Liturgy there could be no toleration. The opposition to it had grown virulent. It amounted to fanatical hatred.

To some, we say, all this may have seemed strange. But it is accounted for by the theological life of the new Order of Worship. Had the book been a mere pulpit Liturgy, a collection of dry forms for the use of the minister in the usual style of such mechanical helps, it would have called forth no such virulent opposition. But it was something altogether different from that. It carried with it the spirit and power of a true altar Liturgy; and in this character it was felt to involve, not simply a scheme of religious service, but a scheme also of religious thought and belief, materially at variance with preconceived opinion in certain quarters; the sense of which then became instinctively, where such opinion prevailed, a feeling of antagonism to the whole work. Thus at our late General Synod, the liturgical discussion proved to be, in fact, an earnest

theological discussion, the interest of which extended far beyond the particular denominational occasion that gave rise to it. It was remarkable, indeed, that the opponents of the new Liturgy seemed to lay comparatively little stress on the mere ritual points, to which at other times they have taken exception. The question of responses, for example, hardly came into the argument at all. Every other consideration was for the time swallowed up by the question of doctrine. And here, again, the special was evidently ruled by the general. It was not so much dissatisfaction with single doctrinal statements here and there in the Liturgy, as hostility rather to its whole doctrinal basis, that roused and led on the war for its destruction. The Liturgy represented one system of religious thought; the opposition to it represented another; the two constitutionally different, and mutually repellent. Hence the controversy.

On the floor of the Synod, this controversy was met by the friends of the Liturgy with overwhelming success. The charges brought against it were shown to be untenable and false. Its doctrinal orthodoxy was triumphantly sustained. In the nature of the case, at the same time, this defence rebounded into the form of an attack upon the orthodoxy of the opposite side. It was shown that the offence taken with the Liturgy resulted from want of sympathy with the true idea of the Gospel, as this is owned and set forth in the forms of the Liturgy; and that the party opposing it was itself, therefore, theologically unsound, as standing in the bosom of a system which, as far as it prevails, draws after it the rationalistic subversion of the Christian faith altogether. The real character of the system in this view, it may be added, cropped out actually, from time to time, in the speeches which were made from that side of the house; in a way that served, if not actually to horrify, at least very seriously to startle, the better sensibilities of many, who had been brought up to believe different things.

What we propose now, is to bring this momentous issue between the Liturgy and its enemies into wider public view.

Vast pains have been taken all along to disseminate doubts of its orthodoxy, and to create in this way a prejudice against it in the mind of the Church. Heretofore the way has not been open properly for meeting the loose, and always more or less indefinite charge. Now, however, the time seems to have come for laying aside all silence and reserve in regard to the subject. The theological character of the Liturgy has been challenged, in a style which makes it proper and necessary to confront the challenge. Our object in this article is immediately and primarily its defence; but all such defence, as we have just seen, is necessarily at the same time a polemical assault on the system of theological thinking, from which the challenge in question proceeds. Such is the nature of the issue here joined. If the opponents of the Liturgy are sound in their theological premises, the Liturgy of course must be considered theologically unsound; but if it should appear, that it is the Liturgy in fact which rests in sound premises, then we shall know with equal certainty, that the charge of unsoundness falls upon the other side. Our vindication in one direction, becomes thus, as a matter of course, crimination in another direction. We turn upon the theological enemies of the Liturgy their own charge. In the prosecution of our argument, we shall cause it to appear that they are themselves unevangelical, just where they call in question the evangelical character of the Liturgy. We shall be under the painful necessity of showing, that by their own concession, or in the way of unavoidable inference from their premises, they stand committed to views that are heretical in the worst sense of the term.

Let it be understood, however, that this accusation is not preferred against the adversaries of the Liturgy indiscriminately. We have limited the charge purposely to its *theological* enemies; that is, to those who, consciously or unconsciously, hate and oppose the system of theological belief, in whose bosom it stands, and from whose inspiration it draws its life and power. We would fain hope, that even among these there may be some, whose minds are not closed absolutely against

the truth, and who need only the help of some candid and dispassionate inquiry to be made sensible of the danger of following blindly the prejudices by which they are now led. Beyond the range of all such theological opposition, however, there is a large amount of disaffection felt toward the Liturgy at present, which rests upon other grounds altogether. It is the result of misrepresentations industriously circulated, of fears blindly awakened, of prejudices adroitly played upon by party address—all in profound ignorance, for the most part, of what the Liturgy actually is, and of what it proposes to do. With better information, much of this disaffection may be expected to disappear. The friends of the Liturgy, at all events, are very willing to have it put as widely as possible to this test. They only ask that it should be allowed to face all such popular prejudice on its own merits. Let the people have an opportunity to judge for themselves, whether it be suitable to their wants or not. We do not shrink from this tribunal, even in our present theological argument. On the contrary, we appeal to it without fear. It was said on the floor of Synod, indeed, by one who opposed the Liturgy, that its theology was of too deep a character to be intelligible to the people. As if the people, forsooth, could not find themselves properly in the Creed, the Te Deum, the Lord's Prayer, the Litany, the Ten Commandments, the Church Lessons and Collects, but only in the creations, extemporaneous or otherwise, let down upon them in the usual style from the modern pulpit. We have no such low opinion of the capacity of our laity. In the case before us, many of them at least have theological instincts, which are better and safer than all scholastic speculations; to say nothing of traditional beliefs, which no logic can set aside. To these instincts and beliefs we now make our confident appeal.

As already said, the doctrinal objections made to the Liturgy at particular points, refer themselves throughout to its general theology, the scheme or theory of Christianity, taken as a whole, in which its different parts are comprehended. A proper regard to order requires then, that we should direct our attention first to this general scheme. Only after the theology of

the Liturgy in such broad view has been vindicated, will the way be open for considering briefly the errors charged upon it in special instances.

What, now, is the reigning theology of the Liturgy? It is sometimes spoken of in this country as the Mercersburg Theology. But the system is far wider in fact than any such name; and no name of this sort besides can give us any true insight into its interior character and constitution. What we need here, is not a distinctive title for the theology in question, but a distinguishing apprehension of its nature. For our present purpose it may answer to characterize it descriptively, (without pretending to exhaust the subject), under a threefold view. In the first place, it is Christological, or more properly perhaps Christocentric; in the second place, it moves in the bosom of the Apostles' Creed; in the third place, it is Objective and Historical, involving thus the idea of the Church as a perennial article of faith. These three conceptions are closely intertwined; but they admit and deserve separate consideration.

CHRISTOCENTRIC THEOLOGY.

The term is sufficiently clear. It explains itself. We mean by it, of course, that the theology before us centres in Christ. He is not simply the author of its contents: these contents gather themselves up into Him ultimately as their root. As an object of faith and knowledge, and in the only form in which it can be regarded as having reality in the world, Christianity has been brought to pass through the mystery of the Incarnation, and stands perpetually in the presence and power of that fact. All its verities, all its doctries, all its promises, all its life-giving forces, root themselves continually in the undying life of Him, who thus became man for us men and for our salvation. And such being the actual objective constitution of Christianity, it would seem to be at once plain that our apprehension of it, to be either right or safe, must move in the same order. It must plant itself boldly and broadly on the proposition, that Jesus Christ is the principle of Christianity, and that the full sense of the Gospel is to be reached only in and

through the revelation which is comprehended in His glorious Person. In doing this it will become necessarily such a theology, such a way of looking at the Christian salvation, as we are now trying to describe. Learned or unlearned, it will be a theology that revolves around Christ as a centre, and is irradiated at all points by the light that flows upon it from his presence.

For the right knowledge of things everywhere, all depends on their being surveyed from the right point of view. Facts and forms are not enough; they must be apprehended in their true relations; and this requires that the beholder should occupy, in regard to them, such a centre of observation as may enable him to see them in this way. Even an outward landscape, to be seen to advantage, must be seen from the proper position. So as regards any field or range of science. The astronomy of the old world, for example, abounded in observation and study; was furnished with vast material of phenomena and facts; accomplished much in the way of scientific comparison, induction, and generalization. But it labored throughout with embarrassment and confusion, because its scheme of the heavens was projected from a wrong standpoint. It made the earth to be the centre of the system to which it belongs, and studied the motions of the heavenly bodies exclusively from this false assumption. It was geocentric, as we say, in its contemplations, and therefore every where at fault. The Copernican system, in the fulness of time, redeemed the science, and made room for its modern triumphs; not primarily by the revelation of new facts, but by finding the true centre of observation for the apprehension of old facts. It planted its scientific lever in the sun, instead of the earth, bringing its studies thus into harmony with the objective order of the world it sought to understand and expound. Astronomy, in other words, ceased to be geocentric, and became heliocentric. Hence all its later enlargement and success.

Now what this heliocentric (sun-centre) standpoint is for the right study of the heavens in the science of astronomy, we affirm the Christocentric (Christ-centre) standpoint to be, for

the right study of heavenly and eternal things in the science of theology. No other standpoint can be substituted for it without boundless error and confusion. It is possible to bring in here a different centre of observation; nay, it is the natural vice of our fallen reason, that it tends continually to throw itself upon a different centre; for the full practical sense of what Christ is in this respect, belongs only to the world of faith, which as such is at the same time the world of what transcends all natural reason. We may have a simply anthropological divinity—a mere humanitarian theology; all centering in the idea of man (anthropocentric); the earth again ruling the heavens, and the merely moral or ethical, at best, playing itself off as the divine. Or we may have, on the other hand, a simply theological divinity—a construction of theology starting from the idea of God, considered absolutely and outside of Christ (theocentric); in which the relations of God to the world, then, will become pantheistic, fantastic, visionary, and unreal; and all religion will be made to resolve itself at last into metaphysical speculations or theosophic dreams. How far these false projections of Christian doctrine, in one view antagonistic, and yet in another everlastingly intermarried, have made themselves mischievously felt in the Christian world, through all Protean forms and shapes, from their first bad birth as Ebionism and Gnosticism, down to the Socinianism, Anabaptism, and metaphysical Calvinism of the sixteenth century, and down still farther to corresponding forms of religious thought in our own time—this is not the proper place to inquire. Our object is simply to fix attention on the possibility of such wrong constructions of Christianity, for the purpose of insisting with more effect on the necessity of a construction that shall start from the right point of observation; and to make fully apparent, moreover, how much is comprehended in what we say, when we affirm that this right point of observation is the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that no theology, therefore, can be either safe or sound, or truly Christian, which does not show itself to be in this view a truly Christocentric theology.

The proposition needs no proof. It is a first principle, a self-evident axiom, in Christianity. To doubt it, is to call Christ Himself into doubt. Has He not said: "I am the Light of the world"? Is it not His own voice that still rings through the ages from the isle of Patmos: "I am alpha and omega, the first and the last"? The natural world begins and ends in Him; for "all things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made" (John i. 3); and again we are told, "by Him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by Him, and for Him; and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist" (Col. i. 16, 17). The ethical world, the movement of humanity, the world of history as it may be called, begins and ends in Him; it is not chaotic, the sport of blind chance or iron fate; Christ is in it, causing all its powers and forces to converge throughout to what shall be found to be at last the world's last sense in the finished work of redemption. Finally, the world of revelation begins and ends in Him; it is not a number of independent utterances, properly speaking, given forth from God, but a single economy or system, through which God has made Himself known among men, with progressive manifestation, in the way, not of doctrine primarily and immediately, but of act and deed; the entire movement having its principle or root in Christ from the first, centering at last in the historical fact of the Incarnation, and running its course thence onward to the hour of His second appearing, when He shall come to be glorified in His saints, and admired in all them that believe. Jesus Christ is the alpha and omega of all these worlds (nature, history and grace), and as such the principle, centre and end, therefore, in which they all meet, and gather themselves together finally, as one (Eph. i. 10). This being so, where shall we find the key to a correct knowledge of the world, or of man, or of God, if not in that which is set before us as the first object of the Christian faith, the mysterious constitution of His blessed Person? Above all, what can we ex-

pect to know rightly in the sphere of revelation (among the facts of the Bible, and amid the "powers of the world to come" that are lodged in the Church), without the help of this key? The Old Testament throughout has no sure sense or force, except in the Christological view of its being a subordinate, relatively imperfect discipline or pedagogy, whereby the way was prepared for the coming of Christ in the flesh. It has no power to explain or interpret Christ, save only so far as it is itself made intelligible first in and through Christ. Then, as regards Christianity itself, strictly taken, what is it, we may well ask, in difference from all else pretending to call itself religion, if it be not the product and outgrowth of the new order of life, which first became actual in the world by the assumption of our human nature into union with the Divine Word (John i. 14, 17), having in this view its beginning, middle, and end in Christ, and in Christ only?

And how then, having such objective constitution, and standing thus actually and entirely in the historical being of Christ, beyond which it must necessarily resolve itself into nothing, as having no basis of faith whereon to rest; being in such sort bound to Christ, we repeat, as the alpha and omega, sum and substance of its whole existence, how possibly shall Christianity be studied and understood aright, either practically or doctrinally, either as a system of life, or as a system of theology, if it be not in the Christocentric way of which we are now speaking? To comprehend the "world which grace has made," we must take our position by faith in the great primordial centre, from which all has been evolved, and there fixing our spiritual telescope, endeavor, as best we may, to scan the wonders thus offered to our contemplation; being well assured that from any other centre, they will either not be seen at all, or else will be seen only under more or less distorted forms, and in more or less false relations and proportions. This centrality of Christ, in the Christian system, reaches forth to all parts of the system. Practically, all righteousness, all morality, all virtue, in the Christian sense, grow forth from the "law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus." All sound Christian feeling and experience,

flow from the sense of Christ formed in us as the hope of glory. And so intellectually also, Christ is our wisdom, the principle of all true Christian illumination and knowledge. Through Him only we are made to know man, his original destination, and the full extent of his fall. Through Him only, we come to have an insight into the true nature of sin, the power of the devil, the meaning of death, the idea of redemption, and the progress of the Christian salvation out to the resurrection of the last day. Through Him only, do we ever come to the true understanding of God, "in the knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life."

The theology now under consideration is decidedly of this character. It revolves around Christ. It has been strangely enough charged at times with subordinating the idea of Christ to the idea of the Church. But this is a gross mistake, if not a perverse slander. The theology in question does, indeed, lay stress on the doctrine of the Church, as stress is laid on it also in the Apostles' Creed; but only as the Church is held to be the necessary consequence of Christ (following the Creed in this also), and never as putting the Church in Christ's place. No theology in the country certainly has made more of Christ as the centre of its thinking and teaching. No theology has insisted more earnestly on the great cardinal truths of the Trinity, the Eternal Generation, the Divinity of the Son, the Incarnation, the Mediatorial Work and Reign of Christ; and no theology, it may be safely asserted, has done more, within the same time, to awaken and enforce attention to the practical significance of these truths in the American religious world.

This brings us to the consideration of what we have already named as its second distinguishing characteristic, namely; the fact, that it moves throughout in the bosom of the old Creeds, the original *regula fidei* of the Christian world.

RULED BY THE APOSTLES' CREED.

It is not necessary to waste time here on the half-learned criticisms, we hear made continually, in certain quarters, on the title and origin of this symbol. We know that it was not com-

posed strictly by the Apostles; that it took form gradually; that there were different Creeds in the first centuries; and that among these, the formula used at Rome finally gained general credit in the fifth and sixth centuries, so as to become, for subsequent times, what is now denominated the Apostles' Creed. All this we know; but we know also, at the same time, that this final settlement upon the Roman form, involved no giving up or changing any where of a single point of faith; that the different Creeds previously, were only variations of one and the same confessional theme; that what was added to its utterance in any case, came in only as the explicit enunciation of what was included in it implicitly before; and that all in this way resolved itself into a common rule of faith, or canon of truth, which the universal Church held from the beginning as of Apostolic origin and Apostolic authority. In this character, the symbol has been received through all ages, by all branches of the Church, both Oriental and Occidental, as the primary and most fundamental expression of the Christian faith. Protestantism has claimed, from the beginning, to stand here on the same ground with Roman Catholicism. The Reformed Church, no less than the Lutheran, starts confessionally with the Apostles' Creed. Our own admirable Heidelberg Catechism, in particular, makes it, in form, the ground and rule of all it professes to teach in the way of faith.

The Apostles' Creed thus is the deepest, and for that reason most comprehensive of all Christian symbols. It lies at the foundation of all evangelical unity; it is the last basis and bond of comprehension in the conception of the Church. No sect refusing to stand on this basis, can have any right to claim footing in the Gospel, or fellowship with the Apostles.

All right theological thinking then, as well as all true evangelical believing, must start where this fundamental form of faith starts, and keep step with it at every point as far as it goes. The reason of this is plain. It lies in the constitution of the Creed; which is no summary of Christian doctrine primarily for the understanding, but the necessary form of the Gospel, as this is first apprehended by faith; a direct transcript,

we may say, of what the Gospel is to the contemplation of the believer, turned wholly upon the Person of Christ. Such faith is necessarily ruled by its object; the Creed, in other words, must be Christological, must unfold itself, first of all, in the order of what are to be regarded as the fundamental facts of Christianity, growing forth from the mystery of the Incarnation. In such view, there is no room to speak of two or more different methods of faith for taking in the sense of the Gospel. As there is but one method of the objective movement of the Gospel in Christ Himself, so can there be only one method for the apprehension of it on the part of believers. That method we have in the Apostles' Creed; and any attempt to set this aside, to substitute for it some different construction of first principles, or to subordinate its proper normative authority and signification to any later type of belief, must be looked upon at once as a serious falling away from the Gospel, and may be expected to result at last in the confusion and eclipse of faith altogether.

All this the theology before us owns and holds steadily in view. Starting in Christ, it follows the order in which the facts of religion unfold themselves with necessary connection from His Person. This order is for it not optional simply, but is felt to be inwardly bound to its own principle. It is the immanent logic of faith, determined by Him who is the central object of faith. It makes all the difference in the world in this view, whether a system of theological thought be cast in the type of doctrine that is set forth in the Creed, or constructed in some other way. To some it may seem comparatively indifferent, how the topics of religion are put together, if only the same topics nominally are made use of in the work; the form is of no account, they fancy; all depends upon the matter. But this imagination itself shows at once the wrong position of those who hold it, and is really nothing less than a vast theological blunder. The form here is in fact everything; the matter nothing, we may say, except as embraced in this form. It is a vain pretence, therefore, to say, that the authority of the Creed is sufficiently acknowledged, by allowing

it to be in substance a true, though defective, representation of the Gospel, and then going on to work up the material of it into some supposed better scheme of doctrine, projected from another standpoint altogether, and moving throughout in a totally different line of thought. No confession, no catechism, no preaching, no worship, no system of divinity, carried forward in this way, can ever breathe the spirit of the Creed, or have in it the true life of the Creed; however much it may try to make the world believe that it is at the bottom in harmony with the "undoubted articles of our Christian faith," as we have them set forth in this radical symbol.

Hence it is, that where such pretended reconstructions of the material of faith prevail, the honor shown to the Creed is in fact nominal only, and theoretic at best, and never practically real. We all know how completely the symbol has fallen out of use, in all those portions of the Church, in which such reconstructed divinity has come to have the upper hand. Evidence enough, what a difference it makes, whether our religion grow forth, or not, from this "form of sound words," delivered unto us from the Apostles. The difference reaches into all spheres of practical Christianity; into family religious training; into the Sunday-school; into the work of catechetical instruction; into the character of preaching; into all sanctuary services; into all devotional offices. In the same way it reaches to every point of doctrinal Christianity. There is not a Christian dogma, that is not affected by it in the most serious manner.

The theology of the Creed does not stop short, of course, with the few, primordial articles of that first, immediate panoramic vision of faith. Within the range of this regulative scheme, it finds room for any amount of scientific study and enlargement, through the use of what matter is offered to it for this end in God's Revelation, and in the exercise of a reason that is now purified for its office by the inspiration of God's Holy Spirit; the very element, as it were, of the world of faith in which the Gospel is here felt to move. But through all such enlargement, the organization of doctrine remains rooted and

grounded in the objective mystery of the new creation in Christ Jesus, as this has been first apprehended in the form of the Creed; and every doctrine is an outgrowth from this, having thus its position, complexion and quality in the system, both for faith and for knowledge, as it could not possibly have them in any other way. Every doctrine, in this way, becomes Christological, and serves to express a truth which is true only within the orbit of the Creed, and not at all on the outside of it.

It would be interesting to verify this in particular cases, by showing how the doctrine of the atonement, for example, the article of justification by faith, the idea of regeneration, the conception of sacramental grace, are found to be always something materially different in the theology of the Creed from what they are made to be in any other theology; but it would carry us too far for our present purpose, to pursue the subject in this way. We have said enough to show of what immense account the characteristic is, by which the theological system we are now defending is distinguished as being the theology of the Creed; and what a gulph of separation this necessarily involves, between it and all antagonistic theologies; which, however loud mouthed they may be in the use of cant evangelical shibboleths, stand convicted, nevertheless, of being profoundly unevangelical, just because they show themselves wanting in every sort of genuine sympathy and loyalty for the Apostles' Creed, through which the original voice of the Gospel has come sounding down upon us from the earliest times.

The theology we are defending may be said to be specially identified with the honor of the Apostles' Creed, in the religious history of this country. In our Reformed Zion, twenty-five years ago, the Creed had become almost a dead letter. It still kept its place in the Heidelberg Catechism; but that itself was in a fair way to have its life smothered out of it, by the incubus which had come to settle upon it in the form of Methodistic Puritanism; and for the fundamental significance of the gem it here held enshrined in its bosom, there appeared to be but small sense anywhere. The Creed was not heard commonly in our pulpits, and had fallen into neglect largely in our families.

Now, however, all is changed. The voice of the old symbol is once more restored. Our children are familiar with it. Along with the Lord's Prayer, it has forced itself into general liturgical use among us, even where the new Liturgy is still feared for the theological spirit that has wrought such auspicious change.

For can there be any doubt of the source from which this great change has sprung? Do we not owe it entirely to the Christological tendency, that has been at work among us for the last twenty years; which was so much assisted in its own development by the study of the Creed; and which at the same time wrought effectually to restore this to popular confidence and use?

And no one, who has observed attentively the course of things, can doubt, but that the power of this testimony has been felt, also, far beyond the narrow limits of our Reformed Church. There is a deplorable want of real sympathy still with this archetypal form of sound words, on all sides; but, a reactionary feeling has begun to set in evidently in its favor. It would be hard probably to find now, even in Puritan New England itself, any respectable so called Orthodox voice, prepared to say, as the pious "Puritan Recorder" could venture to do in 1849, that the Apostles' Creed has become, for the orthodoxy of New England, a "fossil relic of by gone ages"—a dead formulary, which "teaches in several respects anti-scriptural doctrines," so that it must be pitiful, therefore, to think of "infusing life into it, and setting it up again as a living ruler in the Church." A change, we say, has begun to come over the spirit of that dream; and our theology unquestionably has had something at least to do with bringing it about. No other theology in the country, certainly, has labored more to re-animate the symbol with its pristine life. No other has so borne it on high as the chosen banner of its faith. And we will add also in good trust, of no other is there more room to say, *In hoc signo vinces.*

OBJECTIVE AND HISTORICAL.

Starting in the great fact of the Incarnation, and following its movement, our theology has finally the third general character of being Objective and Historical. In other words, it is not a system simply of subjective notions, a metaphysical theory of God and religion born only of the human mind, a supposed apprehension of supernatural verities brought into the mind in the way of abstract thought; but it is the apprehension of the supernatural by faith under the form of an actual Divine manifestation in and through Christ, which, as such, rules and governs the power that perceives it, while it is felt also to be joined in its own order to the natural history of the world onward through all time. So much lies at once in the Apostles' Creed.

All revelation is primarily something that God does—an objective, supernatural manifestation, which causes His presence to be felt in the world. The right apprehension of what is thus exhibited, which can be only through the inspiration of His Spirit, becomes then the power of His word in the souls of those to whom it is addressed. Universally, it would seem, the inward illumination is bound to the outward manifestation in this way. God does not speak to the souls of men immediately and abruptly, as enthusiasts and fanatics fondly dream; that would be magic, and gives us the Pagan idea of religion, not the Christian. The order of all true supernatural teaching is, the objective first, and the subjective or experimental afterwards, as something brought to pass only by its means. Most of all, we may say, is this true of Christianity, the absolute end of all God's acts of revelation. Its whole significance is comprehended, first of all, in the Divine deed, whereby God manifested Himself in the flesh, through the mystery of the Incarnation. This objective act is itself the Gospel, in the profoundest sense of the term. In the very nature of the case, it must underlie and condition all that the Gospel can ever become for men, in the way of inward experience. True, it cannot save men without their being brought to experience its power; on which account it is, that we need to be placed in

communication with it through faith; but the power that saves is not, for this reason, in our experience or faith; it is wholly in the object with which our faith is concerned. The subjective here, sundered from the objective, can give us at best only a spurious evangelicalism, which will always be found, in the end, to be more nearly allied to the flesh than to God's Spirit.

Apprehended under such objective view, the revelation which God has been pleased to make of Himself through Jesus Christ (not in the way of oracle but of act), becomes necessarily, for our faith, at the same time historical. Only so can it be felt to be real, and not simply notional and visionary. Its objectivity itself implies, that it has entered permanently into the stream of the world's life, not just as the memory of a past wonder, but as the continued working of the power it carried with it in the beginning. The Gospel is supernatural; but it is the supernatural joined in a new order of existence to the natural; and this, it can be only in the form of history. In any other form, it becomes shadowy and unreal. Sense for the objective in Christianity, leads thus universally to sense for the historical; while those who make all of subjectivity are sure to be unhistorical.

The historical character of the Gospel, objectively considered, meets us, first of all, in the Person and Work of Christ Himself, as they are exhibited to us in the Creed. Its articles are not so many theological propositions loosely thrown together, but phases that mark the progress of what may be considered the dramatic development of His Mediatorial Life, out to its last consequence in the full salvation of His people. This, of itself, however, involves then, in the next place, as we may at once see, the historical character of Christianity also, regarded as the carrying out of this mystery of godliness among men to the end of time. Not only the subjective religious experiences and opinions of men here are to be regarded as entering into the general flow of history, like their political or scientific judgments, but the objective reality, from which Christianity springs, the new order of existence which was constituted for the world by the great fact of the Incarnation, must be allowed also to be historical. Only in such view can we possibly retain

our hold on the objectively supernatural, as it entered into the original constitution of the Gospel. It is not enough for this purpose, to have memories only of what was once such a real presence in the world. It lies in the very conception of the Gospel, in this objective view, that its supernatural economy should be of perennial force, that its resources and powers of salvation should be "once for all;" not in the sense of something concluded and left behind, as many seem to imagine, but in the sense of what, having once entered into the life of the world, has become so incorporated with it as to be part of its historical being to the end of time.

But this conception of a supernatural economy having place among men under an objective, historical form, an order of grace flowing from Christ, and altogether different from the order of nature, is nothing more nor less than the idea of the Holy Catholic Church as we have it in the Creed. We can see thus how it is, that this article holds the place assigned to it in that symbol. It is not there by accident or caprice. It is there as part of the faith, which is required to take in the objective, historical movement of the grace that is comprehended in our Lord Jesus Christ; and it meets us exactly at the right point, as setting forth the form and manner in which Christ, by the Holy Ghost, carries forward His work of salvation in the world. If we are to hold fast the objective, historical character of what this work was first, and still continues to be, in His own Person, it cannot be allowed to lose itself in the agency of the Spirit under a general view; it must, necessarily, involve for us the conception of a special sphere; this likewise objective and historical; within which only (and not in the world at large), the Holy Ghost of the Gospel is to be regarded as working. This is the Church. It comes in just here as a necessary postulate of the Christian faith. Standing in the bosom of the Creed, we cannot get round it. It is a mystery, like all the other articles of the symbol, which we are required to believe, because it flows with necessary derivation from the coming of Christ in the flesh. Our belief in it is not founded in our empirical knowledge of it, our having come to be sure of its ex-

istence and attributes in some other way. In that case it would not be faith at all in the sense of the Creed. What faith has to do with properly, here as elsewhere, is the supernatural belonging to its object; and that comes to us, not in the way of natural experience and observation, but only in the way of *a priori* challenge and demand addressed to us directly from its own sphere. We do not believe, as the old adage has it, because we understand, but we believe in order that we may understand. Where there is no faith of this sort in the Church, going before all inquiries in regard to what it is and where it is for outward view, it is not to be expected that these inquiries can be carried forward with much earnestness or effect. We may not be able to explain fully the meaning of our Saviour's descent to hades, or the time and manner of His second advent; but that is no reason why these articles should not be firm objects of our faith; we believe them, because they are felt to be involved in the objective movement of the Gospel itself in Christ's Person. And just so we believe the Church. We cannot get along without it, in our conception of the real, objective, historical working of Christ's Mediatorial Life in the world. This must, to be real at all, have a sphere of its own; which, as such, becomes, then, an order or constitution of grace, in distinction from the world in its simply natural constitution; exactly what we mean by the Church as an article of faith, back of all questions in regard to its outward organization and form. We cannot get along without it, we say, in the objective movement of the Creed. Do away with it, as modern spiritualists require, and this movement is, for our faith, brought suddenly to an end. It is either sublimated into magic, or precipitated at once into the order of mere nature.

The theology we are speaking of, then, is churchly. It believes in the Church, as we have the article in the Apostles' Creed; believes in it as a mystery, which comes in necessarily just where it stands in the Creed, as part of the ongoing movement of the general mystery of salvation, that starts in the Incarnation. It believes in an economy of grace, a sphere of supernatural powers and forces flowing from the historical fact of

Christ's birth, death, and glorification, which are themselves present in the world historically (not magically), in broad distinction from the economy of nature; and in the bosom of which only, not on the outside of it, the Gospel can be expected to work as the wisdom of God and the power of God unto salvation. So far as this goes, of course, it owns and confesses that the Church is a medium of communication between Christ and His people. They must be in the order of His grace, in the sphere where this objective working of His grace is actually going forward, and not in the order of nature, where it is not going forward at all (but where Satan reigns and has his own way), if the work of redemption and sanctification is to be carried forward in them with full effect. In this sense, most assuredly, salvation is of the Church, and not of the world; and to look for it in the world, by private spiritualistic negotiations with God, professedly and purposely pouring contempt on the idea of all church intervention, is to look for it where it is not to be found.

This, of course, means a great deal; and draws after it, in the way of necessary consequence, much that we cannot now think of noticing in detail. A churchly theology can never run in the same direction with a theology that is unchurchly; and can never breathe the same spirit. Not because it makes less of Christ, as this last is ever ready to charge; but because it makes more of Christ, and cannot consent to have Him turned into a Gnostic phantom. Not because it is less evangelical, as the unchurchly spirit, with great self-complacency, is forever prompt to assume; but because it rests in a more profound and comprehensive apprehension of the Gospel.

Such a churchly theology, we feel at once, can never be otherwise than sacramental. Where the idea of the Church has come to make itself felt in the way now described, as involving the conjunction of the supernatural and the natural continuously in one and the same abiding economy of grace, its sacraments cannot possibly be regarded as outward signs only of what they represent. They become, for faith, seals also of the actual realities themselves, which they exhibit; mysteries, in which the visible and the invisible are bound together

by the power of the Holy Ghost (not physically or locally, as vain talkers will forever have it), in such sort, that the presence of the one is, in truth, the presence of the other.

In the end, also, unquestionably, the sacramental feeling here cannot fail to show itself a liturgical feeling. There is an inward connection between all the forms of religious thinking we have had thus far under consideration. They run into one another, and require one another to be in any sense, complete. A theology which is truly Christocentric, must follow the Creed, must be objective, must be historical; with this, must be churchly; and with this again, must be sacramental and liturgical. It must be liturgical, moreover, in a sense agreeing with these affinities throughout—the only sense, in fact, in which it is not absurd to talk of worship in this form. It can never be satisfied with anything less than an altar liturgy. A mere pulpit liturgy, a hand-book of forms for the exclusive use of the minister, must ever seem to it, in comparison, something very unrefreshing, not to say miserably cold and dry.

The enemies of the new Liturgy are right, then, in saying, that it is the product of the general scheme of theology we have now tried to characterize and describe, and that the spirit of this theology pervades, more or less, all its offices and forms. For this reason it is, in truth, that they dislike it, and would be glad to get it out of the way. Standing, as they do, in another order of religious thought altogether, they feel that the Liturgy is against them, and their instinct of self-preservation, as it were, impels them to seek its destruction. In this way, our liturgical controversy is, in reality, a great theological controversy; one that should be of interest to other Protestant Churches, no less than to our own. We see in it two general schemes of theology; two different versions, we may say, of the meaning of Christianity; two Gospels, in fact, arrayed against one another, with the feeling on both sides, that if one be true the other must necessarily be wrong and false. One of these schemes is the theology we have been thus far trying to describe; the other is the opposite of this, the Puritanic un-

churchly scheme, we may call it, in which the enemies of the Liturgy now openly stand.

ANTI-LITURGICAL THEOLOGY.

And what, now, is this Puritanic scheme? It admits within it different constructions, Calvinistic, Arminian, Methodist, Baptistic, and so on in all manner of sect forms; but what we are concerned with here is only its general character, the underlying common basis of these distinctions, as this presents itself to our view in broad contrast with the general character of the scheme we have just been considering. And even this general view must be taken at present in a very cursory, wholesale way. It will be sufficient, however, we trust, to show all unprejudiced persons, whose image and superscription the system in question bears, and in the service of what cause it works.

What, we ask again, is this Puritanic scheme, which finds a "serpent" in the new Liturgy, and sees in it only a poisoned chalice offered to the lips of the people? We will now answer.

It is a scheme, which betrays itself at once by its apostacy from the primitive *regula fidei* of the Christian Church, the Apostles' Creed. We know how it is ready at times, especially in our German Churches, to squirm under this charge, and how, like some slimy eel, it tries to slip from beneath it with every sort of disingenuous evasion. But we mean now to hold it tightly to the accusation; and to do this before the people (the elders especially and laity in general of the Reformed Church), so that all may be able to see and know just what this false popular evangelicalism means, and in what direction it leads. It is constitutionally and inwardly at war with the Creed. It cannot frame its mouth to pronounce the symbol in its true original sense; but claims the right of putting into its articles, where it may please, a better modern sense of its own.

Hear, on this point, the "Puritan Recorder," in 1849. The Puritans, it says, receive the Creed "in a sense consonant with their theology," either leaving out altogether, for example, the article of the descent to hades, or putting upon it a constrained meaning to suit themselves. "But it is neither safe nor expe-

dient," the Recorder honestly adds, "to receive such a document in such a perverted sense; for the document once being admitted, and its authority being made to bind the conscience, then the way is open for those who hold the errors held by its authors, to plead that we are bound to receive it in the sense which its authors gave to it, and this makes it an instrument of corrupting the faith of the Gospel." Honest confession! True divination! The voice of the Creed allowed to proclaim itself from week to week, without note or comment, in the churches of New England, would, in the course of a few years, we verily believe, sap the foundations of their existing orthodoxy, and turn the stream of their church life into a wholly new channel. But any such use of the Creed among them now would be cried down as a Romanizing tendency or a hankering after ritualism; as it would be also still, in spite of the little reactionary movement we see working here and there the other way, in all branches of American Presbyterianism. In these ecclesiastical regions, Puritanism has killed the Apostles' Creed out of all practical and theological use. It has become for them a dead letter, in family and school, in the pulpit and in the divinity hall. Let the thoughtful, everywhere, consider well what this means. We speak plainly, because the fact is plain.

In our Reformed Church, especially since the theological revival we have had among us these last years, no tongue would dare to wag itself against the Creed in the fashion of the "Puritan Recorder." With us now at least, the symbol is no dead letter, but a living witness of Apostolical truth. So our people are coming to regard it more and more. But the Puritanic spirit is still among us to a certain extent; and as far as it is so, it remains true still, in jesuitical disguise, to the outspoken confession of the Recorder, that the Creed can be mouthed by modern evangelicalism only in a galvanized, so-called non-natural sense.

Were we not told as much as this, to all intents and purposes, on the floor of the late General Synod, at Dayton? Was not the ground there taken by the enemies of the Liturgy, that we had nothing to do with the faith of the third and fourth

centuries, the birth-period of the Creed in its full development, as we now have it; that the faith of that time is not to be considered normative or regulative, in any sense, for the faith of the modern Christian world; that the only primitive faith we are to follow, is what we can get out of the Bible directly for ourselves (every man thus following his own nose), without regard at all to any such objective form of sound words as we find employed to set forth the fundamental belief of Christendom in the first ages? This, of course, was a blow struck at *all* confessionalism; bringing down our Reformed platform, at one stroke, to a flat level with the lowest forms of sectarian subjectivity, and involving us with general confusion in the brotherhood of Anabaptists, Socinians, Quakers, Muggletonians, United Brethren, Winebrennerians, Mormons (for these, too, prate of the Bible in the same Cambyses vein), and others, out to the end of the chapter. Hence, we had, in part, a change of base; the authority of the Creed insidiously assailed from the authority of the Heidelberg Catechism; the faith of the Primitive Church required to shape itself here into conformity with what was represented to be the faith of the sixteenth century. A modern confessionalism in this way made to rule out the sense of the older confessionalism, in which, nevertheless, it professed to have its own root and ground! Did we not hear this nonsense gravely held forth at Synod? Were we not told there, that we are to take the Creed only in the sense of the fathers of the sixteenth century, and not in the sense of the fathers who first used it in the second and third centuries, if this last sense should be found not to square exactly with the sixteenth-century sense, as it was quietly granted might be the case? On the supposition, in other words, of even a casual discrepancy anywhere between the Creed and the Heidelberg Catechism, it was held that the sense of the Catechism must rule, that is, literally coerce, the sense of the Creed; in such way, that the modern symbol shall be held to be of primary normative force, and the primitive œcumenical symbol of only secondary derivative force as taken up into its bosom. How superlatively absurd! What plainer proof could

we have of hostility to the Creed, than the cloven foot thus unceremoniously thrust upon our view? Cannot the people see it everywhere with their own eyes? The matter may be put into a nutshell. Either the Creed, in its original unsophisticated sense, is what the Universal Church in past ages held it to be, the one only true radix and ground type of Christian faith and doctrine; or else it is not this, but a bastard corruption of the Gospel, requiring to be tinkered into new sense at least, if not new form, before it can pass muster as fairly evangelical, in the modern party sense of this much-abused term. These are the two alternatives, without the possibility of any middle ground for even a rope-dancer to stand upon. Where *they* stand, whose acrobatic performances with the subject at Synod have just been noticed, needs no demonstration. They do not own the Creed, in its own proper historical sense, for the original, necessary, and radically sure norm of our Reformed faith; but take it only, in the way the "Puritan Recorder" took it in 1849, as being, "*most of it*, capable of a sense which harmonizes with the Scriptures," going on then to rectify it to their taste, by distilling into it their own fancies, or what they are pleased to consider the elixir of sound thinking drawn from some other quarter. That is, in plain English, the Creed is *not* for them the ultimate symbolical authority of the Reformed Church; and the fathers of the sixteenth century must be regarded as saying what was not true, when they pretended to look upon it in that light. These modern sons of theirs know better now, and have changed all that.

But what now have our people, as a body, to say to the issue, thus fairly made up and brought before them? Will they allow their first symbol, the marrow and kernel of their confessional faith, to be ruthlessly torn from their grasp by this Puritanic enemy, which has stolen in upon us while men slept, and now threatens to rob us of all that is fairest in our theology or church life? Are we to hold on to the Apostles' Creed with good faith, taking it in its own true sense; or shall we have in place of it only a dead corpse of the Creed, eviscerated of its own true sense, and hypocritically hold this up as an argument

of our fealty to the ancient symbol? Are these old primeval articles, this grand architectonic scheme of the everlasting Gospel, to be for us no longer of undoubted catholic or universal authority, as the whole is declared to be in the Heidelberg Catechism? Will the Reformed Church recognize the voice of her true teachers, in those who counsel, directly or indirectly, any such falling away from the faith of the fathers? The appeal is to the people. Let the people answer.

But we are not done yet with this anti-liturgical theology. Its opposition to the Creed shows, of course, a constitutional difference between it and the whole conception of the Gospel contained in this ancient symbol; and from what we have seen already of this, we need have no difficulty in apprehending wherein the difference consists, and to what it amounts. The difference lies just here, and we wish all to ponder and consider it well: The Gospel of the Creed is, throughout, Christological, concentrates itself in Christ, throws itself, in full, upon the Incarnation, and sees in the objective movement of this Mystery of Godliness, as St. Paul calls it, the whole process of grace and salvation on to the resurrection of the dead and the life everlasting; while this other scheme, which we now call, for distinction's sake, the Gospel of Puritanism, substitutes for all this a construction of Christianity that is purely subjective, centering in the human mind, and that gives us then notions for facts, causing metaphysical abstractions to stand for the proper objects of faith, and thus resolves all religion finally into sheer spiritualism; in which no account is made of any objective mediation of grace outside of men, but every man is supposed to come directly, face to face, with God, having, in his evangelical notions simply, whatever is necessary to give him free access to the Divine presence.

The charge of not preaching Christ, we know, is one which this theology will be ready to resent on all sides, as the last that should be seriously preferred against it. It is accustomed to please itself with the imagination of being evangelical, for the very reason that it pretends to make everything of Christ and Him crucified, and in certain of its phases at least is for-

ever ringing changes on the themes of righteousness and free redemption through His name. Is not this the very boast of our unchurchly sects, all the land over, that *they* preach Christ, and Christianity, in opposition to such as lay stress on the idea of the Church, on the sacraments, on outward forms in any view; denouncing every intervention of this sort, as externalism, ecclesiasticism, sacerdotalism, ritualism, or something equally bad, that serves only to obscure the Saviour's glory, and to block up the way to His presence? Who in the world do preach Christ, it may be asked, if it be not these sects, for whom Christ is thus, nominally, all in all?

This we understand. It is an old song; as old as the Gnostics and the Phrygian Montanists, in the days of Tertullian. But we are not to be deceived by it for a moment. Try the spirits, says St. John; do not take them at their own word; try them whether they be of God. And he gives us a simple criterion for the purpose, applicable to all times (1 John iv: 1–3). They come preaching Christ of course. How else could they claim to be Christian? But what sort of a Christ is it that they preach? Is it the historical Christ of the Incarnation. Do they confess that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," not in appearance only, and not for a season only, but in full reality and for all time? Or is their confession of that spiritualistic sort, that resolves His coming in the flesh into a mere speculative dream, long since sublimated in the clouds? In this last case, St. John tells us, its boasting of Christ cannot save it. It is not of God, but is the very spirit of Anti-Christ, just because it sets up a Christ which is the creature of its own subjective thinking, over against and in place of the only true objective and historical Christ of the Gospel, "who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen."

We are not to be put off here with words. Neither can we mince matters in so momentous a case. We reiterate our charge. The theology we are dragging into the light does not preach Christ, as the alpha and omega of the new creation, the beginning, middle, and end of the Gospel. It cannot stand the searching test of St. John. The Christ it talks about is not

the Christ of the Incarnation, as He is made to pass before us in the sublime vision of the old Apostles' Creed; as we hear Him proclaimed (Jesus and the Resurrection and the Second Advent), by St. Peter and St. Paul, in the Acts of the Apostles; as we seem to see Him in the midst of the golden candlesticks, looking forth upon us serenely and grandly from the ecclesiastical literature of the first Christian ages. Not this, verily; as too many of us, alas, have been made painfully to feel; but another form and visage altogether; an object of thought rather than of faith, in looking to which we find that we have at last little more than our own thought to work with; and become like those that feed on wind, in trying to replenish our souls with spiritualities which our souls have themselves produced, instead of the true bread which cometh down from heaven and alone giveth life unto the world.

This is the great constitutional defect of the theology we are sitting in judgment upon; a defect which any jury of plain Christian men can understand; and it is easy to see, to what consequences, in the end, it must necessarily lead. Where the Gospel is not apprehended as the historical, enduring, objective Manifestation of God in the flesh, there can be no steady apprehension of that which constitutes the proper mystery of it in this view, namely, the union there is in it of the supernatural with the natural in an abiding, historical (not magical) form. This precisely is the true object of all evangelical faith, in the New Testament sense; the objective power of salvation, through the apprehension of which only, faith becomes justifying and saving faith. Instead of this, we shall have the supernatural resolved into a spiritualistic presence, seated in the Holy Ghost, and made to reach into the minds of men directly from heaven, in no organic conjunction whatever with the Incarnation; this being considered as, at best, the outward occasion only, and in no sense the inward medium, of the communication. In which case again, what is called justifying faith is no longer tied to the objective Gospel (without which, however, it cannot be *faith* at all), but hugs simply the Gospel of this subjective assurance a man may have of God's mercy in

his own mind, becoming thus, in fact, justification by fancy or feeling. But with the real supernatural of the Gospel metamorphosed in this way into the general notion of the supernatural in a metaphysical view, the whole conception of Christianity, in fact, sinks into the order of nature. The sense of what it is as a continuous constitution of grace, the historical presence of new heavenly powers, through the Spirit in the world, is gone. As with the Gnostics of old, the spiritual has lost all concrete, objective union with the natural. The bond between them has thinned itself into airy speculation. The system has become, in one word, essentially rationalistic. The virus of unbelief is in its veins; and it has no longer power to understand or appreciate fully, at a single point, the Mystery of Godliness, as it was seen of angels, preached to the nations, and believed on in the world, at the beginning.

Hence, the trouble this unhistorical Christianity has everywhere, with whatever comes before it as an assertion of objective grace in the institutions of the Gospel. What is exhibited as thus transcending the order of life in its natural character, is set down at once for superstition. It is, of course, then, unchurchly. A Church in the sense of the Creed—the organ through which Christ works in the world (His body), the medium of His presence among men, the home of His Spirit, the sphere of His grace—is for it no object of faith whatever, but an object rather of instinctive abhorrence and scorn. The office of the ministry flows in its view, not really, but only metaphorically, from Christ's Ascension Gift (Eph. iv: 8–12). Ordination is no investiture with a supernatural commission, proceeding from the Holy Ghost. Apostolical succession, in the case, is an idle dream. Sacraments, as such, are held to be a Romanizing abomination. For the spirit in question, the sacramental in truth, wherever it comes in its way, is a very Ithuriel's spear, the bare touch of which is enough to start it into its real shape, and make it appear the low rationalistic spirit which it is in fact. Sacraments are for it signs only of grace absent, and in no proper sense seals of grace present.

That such a theology as this should have no sympathy with

the true idea of worship in its liturgical form, results, as all can see, from its very constitution; and that it should be found arrayed now against our new Liturgy, is nothing more than what was to be expected. The conflict in the case, as already said, is a conflict of theological systems; not a controversy about a few responses, and a few outward forms (as the ridiculous fuss made in certain quarters about *Ritualism* in the German Reformed Church might seem to imply), but a controversy about doctrines and articles of faith, that strikes far beyond the German Reformed Church into the life of the entire Evangelical Protestantism of this land.

So much for the subject in its general view. The two opposing schemes of divinity are before us in a contrasted form, which even plain people, it is trusted, may be able to understand; if not with full scientific insight always at every point, yet with the insight, at least, of sound theological feeling, which is something far better. It remains now to notice briefly the theological objections made to the Liturgy at certain particular points. They will be found to resolve themselves at once into the general issue, between the two systems which have been thus far compared; and with this in view, it will be very easy to see to what they amount.

PARTICULAR OBJECTIONS.

I. It has been objected at times to the *Ordination Service* (though we heard little of this at Dayton), that it makes too much of the derivation of the office of the Ministry, by historical succession from Christ, and goes too far especially in saying, as it does p. 220, that the gift and grace of the Holy Ghost are to be looked for through the laying on of hands, for the fulfilment of its heavenly commission.

But here the question at bottom is simply, whether the Church is to be regarded at all, or not, as an objective, historical, more than merely natural constitution, carrying in itself powers and functions for its own ends, which are peculiar to itself, and not to be found anywhere else. Is it after all only

like a Temperance Society or a Political Party? What business has it then among the faith mysteries of the Creed?

In the view of the Liturgy, the Church is an organization, as the Creed makes it to be, which is not simply human, but is, at the same time, also, superhuman, in virtue of its organic outflow from the fountain head of all grace and truth in the world, the union of the divine and human in the Person of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, through the mystery of the Incarnation. The organization being such, must not its organs and functions be of a corresponding character? Is the Liturgy wrong in declaring the office of the ministry to be "of divine origin, and of truly supernatural character and force, flowing directly from the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, as the fruit of His resurrection and triumphant ascension into heaven?" Is not this precisely what St. Paul teaches us, in the notable fourth chapter of his Epistle to the Ephesians? May the office come to any one, then, except from Christ, and through the order He has Himself established for handing it down in the Church? "The solemnity of ordination, then, through which this transmission flows," we are justified surely in saying with the Liturgy, "is not merely an impressive ceremony, by which the right of such as are called of God to the ministry, is owned and confessed by the Church; but it is to be considered rather as their actual investiture with the very power of the office itself, the sacramental seal of their heavenly commission, and a symbolical assurance from on high, that their consecration to the service of Christ is accepted, and that the Holy Ghost will most certainly be with them in the faithful discharge of their official duties."

Do we doubt this? Does it come as a strange, mystical, dangerously hierarchical doctrine to our ears? Then must we question, to the same extent, the reality of any such order of grace in the world, as we profess to believe every time we repeat the Creed. Ordination is a mere sham, indeed, if it be not the conveyance of power and right to exercise functions appertaining to the realm or jurisdiction in which it has place, as really as the commission of the civil magistrate is for him

an investiture with qualification he would not otherwise possess, to act in the name of the government he represents. The commission in either case must have quality and force answerable to the order of authority it proceeds from; and this being more than simply human and terrestrial in the case of the Gospel, it follows that the commission here must carry with it corresponding celestial character. Such being the case, it is only part of the faith which properly belongs to the transaction, when ordination is held to be the channel of supernatural official endowment for the work of the ministry; and nothing can be more proper than that the candidate, having made good confession of his general faith previously, should have the question put to him finally: "Are you truly persuaded in your heart, that you are called of God to the office of the holy ministry, and do you desire and expect to receive, through the laying on of our hands, the gift and grace of the Holy Ghost, which shall enable you to fulfil this heavenly commission and trust?"

It goes hard with the spiritualistic system, we know, to admit anything that looks to the real presence of the supernatural in this matter of fact way. The idea of grace tied to any outward occasion as such, the Holy Ghost bound to ordinances, is for it something heterogeneous with its ordinary conception of religion as an affair of purely subjective experience. It is felt to smack of mummery and superstition. Here, especially, comes in the bugbear of priestly manipulation and tactual succession, so easy to be sneered at by the frivolous. But what mummery must it not be, in fact, to go through a form of this sort, without any belief in the reality of what it pretends to be? To insist, that, while it seems to mean much, it means in truth in itself just nothing, and is only the sign of something altogether out of and beyond itself? If ordination be more than the powwowing of Pagan superstition, it *must* involve a real clothing with office in Christ's kingdom; and this can come only from Himself through the Holy Ghost. Does the candidate believe that, and look for it, in the transaction? Do those who lay hands on Him expect it, and mean it in their own

minds? If not, what business have they to be mocking high heaven with their dumb show in this way?

II. *Confession and Absolution.* Exception is taken to the form in the Liturgy, by which the minister is directed, after the General Confession, to assure such as are truly penitent, that their sins are pardoned for Christ's sake (p. 10). It breathes, we are told, an odor of sacerdotalism; and serves to break the direct, immediate relation that should hold in the case between the believer and his Lord.

Now, looking at the form itself, its terms certainly would seem to be safe enough in this view even for the most fastidious Puritanic judgment. For they only say, in fact, what any one may say, and what all are bound to believe, of God's grace toward the penitent through the Gospel. "Unto as many of you, beloved brethren," the form runs, "as truly repent of your sins, and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, with full purpose of new obedience,"—to such and no others—"I announce and declare, by the authority and in the name of Christ"—not by my own or any other authority—"that your sins are forgiven in heaven, according to His Gospel, through the perfect merit of Jesus Christ our Lord." Is there more in this at any time, than the declaration of what is at all times and in all places true? Does it imply that the minister himself pretends to forgive sins? Does it not, in the strongest manner, say just the opposite? What better is it then than spiritualistic prudery of the most captious sort, to put on a show of being scandalized with it in any such view?

But there is more in the matter than this. The offence taken is, after all, with what lies deeper than the form. It is the instinctive working as before of the unchurchly spirit, against what is felt to come in its way here as the mediation of Divine favor through the Church. God only can forgive sins, it says with the Pharisees of old; from Him only, therefore, can we have the blessing in a direct spiritual way—His spirit touching our spirit, without any intervening medium; to conceive of any such instrumentation of His grace *on the earth*, is blasphemy and superstition. In other words, this Gnostic,

rationalistic spirit eschews here, as at all other points, the mystery of an organic, objective, historical connection between the Church of Christ and the Holy Ghost; and refuses to acknowledge the Holy Ghost, the Divine in Christianity, unless in the form only of an intellectual abstraction, bound to the outward organization and order of the Church in no way whatever. Of the "forgiveness of sins," in the sense of the Creed, where it is made to be a mystery for faith holding only in the bosom of the Holy Catholic Church, the spirit in question knows nothing. How should it? Have we not seen already that it is at war with the whole Creed?

The acts of the Church, we have good reason to say, in the exercise of her proper functions, and through her proper organs, are never just the same thing with what might be done by a mere civil corporation presuming to act in the same way. To think or say so, would, indeed, be to blaspheme the Gospel. As official acts, they have in their own sphere a real force, answering to the character of the sphere, and being in fact the form in which its powers reach forward to their proposed end. Who will deny this? No one, it might seem, but an infidel.

Shall we be afraid then to say, that the official act of the minister, the organ of the Church, in blessing the people, or in pronouncing to the penitent the pardon of their sins, means something more than the same declarations would mean, made by some one else in an unofficial and common way? The minister does not originate the pardon he pronounces; neither does the Church; but the voice of the Church, nevertheless, uttered by him and through him, there where he stands in the objective bosom of this grace, may be and is of immense account for bearing the sense of it with full comfort into the believer's heart. If there are any who cannot see this, sustained as it is by the known relation of thought and word universally, and by analogies to be met with everywhere in common life, they are to be pitied for the narrowness of their thinking, rather than argued with seriously in so plain a case.

III. We turn our attention next to the doctrine of the Liturgy in regard to *Baptism*. Exception is taken to it, as teach-

ing baptismal regeneration, substituting a mechanical ceremony for the righteousness of faith, and making a mere outward form to stand for the work of the Holy Spirit. Let us see how the matter really stands.

In somewhat bewildering contrast with this, the same service, which is thus charged with making too little of the sinner's justification, has been reproached for making a great deal too much of his original guilt and condemnation. Many at least, at the Synod at Dayton, could hardly trust their ears, when they heard a Professor of Theology, in the Reformed Church, say there, openly, that he, for his part, could not go with the Liturgy, where it speaks of deliverance of our children through baptism "from the power of the Devil;" he did not believe it to be so bad with the children of Christians naturally as that; it was enough to appeal to the common sensibilities of parents (mothers in particular), to prove the contrary! This sounds strange certainly; but it needs only a little reflection to perceive, that it is, after all, only the working out at a new point of the same false spiritualism, which finds it so hard to understand or acknowledge, on the other side, the presence of any real objective grace in baptism.

The Professor of Theology referred to taught in this case, of course, blank Pelagiansism. Here precisely lay the old theological quarrel between Pelagius and St. Augustine. Pelagius, appealing to the common sensibilities of human nature, would not allow that children are born into the world under the curse of original sin, which is the power of the Devil. St. Augustine maintained the contrary, and what is especially noticeable, confounded Pelagius most of all, by appealing to infant baptism, which could have no meaning, he said, except in the light of a deliverance from the curse of sin conceived of in this real way. So, we know, the Church, also, decided against the heresiarch and his followers; and the decision has been echoed by the orthodoxy of the Christian world, from that day down to the present. We content ourselves with quoting now simply the plain words of the Heidelberg Catechism, the symbol this Professor of Theology has bound himself as with the solemnity

of an oath to teach. "By the fall and disobedience of our first parents, Adam and Eve, in Paradise," the Catechism tells us, Question 7, "our nature became so corrupt, that we are all conceived and born in sin." On this then follows the question: "But are we so far depraved, that we are wholly unapt to any good (*ganz und gar untüchtig zu einigem Guten*), and prone to all evil?" to which is thundered forth, as from Mount Sinai, the soul-shaking answer: "Yes; unless we are born again by the Spirit of God." *How* this new birth by the Spirit is brought to pass, is not here of any account; what we have to do with now is simply the witness of the Catechism to the total depravity of infants. It is plain, direct, overwhelming.

And is not this what we are taught no less plainly in the New Testament? "That which is born of the flesh," our Saviour says to Nicodemus (John iii. 6) "is flesh"—that is, mere human nature in its fallen character, which as such cannot enter the kingdom of God, but is hopelessly on the outside of that kingdom, and so under the power of the Devil; only "that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit;" and for this reason it is, that a man must be born again, "born of water and the Spirit," in order that he may have part in this salvation. But why pursue the argument in this way? Must we go about proving at length for elders and deacons, or for the people at large, in the German Reformed Church, that the Scriptures teach the doctrine of Original Sin? The very children in our Sunday-schools have a sounder theology on this subject, than the Divinity Professor, who so exposed himself in regard to it at the Synod in Dayton.

A Pelagian anthropology leads over naturally to a spiritualistic construction of the whole Christian salvation; in which, as there is no organic power of the Devil or kingdom of darkness, for men to be delivered from, so there will be no organic redemption either, no objective, historical order of grace, in the bosom and through the power of which, this salvation is to go forward; but all will be made to resolve itself into workings of God's Spirit that are of a general character, and into

processes of thought and feeling, on the part of men, with no other basis than the relations of God to man in the most common, simply humanitarian view. Is there then no organic redemption needed for men, into the sphere of which they must come first of all, in order that they may have power to become personally righteous, and so be able to work out their salvation with fear and trembling, as knowing it to be God that worketh in them both to will and to do of His own good pleasure? Has the Church been wrong in believing through all ages, that "we must be delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son" (Col. i. 13), not as the end of our personal goodness and piety, but the beginning of it, and the one necessary condition first of all, without which we can make no progress in goodness or piety whatever? Has the Church been wrong in believing, that such change of state, such transplantation from the kingdom of the Devil over into the kingdom of Christ, must in the nature of the case be a Divine act; and that as such a Divine act, it must be something more than any human thought or volition simply, stimulated into action by God's Spirit? Has the Church been wrong in believing, finally, that the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, the sacrament of initiation into the Church, was instituted, not only to signify this truth in a general way, but to seal it as a present actuality for all who are willing to accept the boon thus offered to them in the transaction?

Baptismal regeneration! our evangelical spiritualists are at once ready to exclaim. But we will not allow ourselves to be put out of course in so solemn an argument, by any catchword of this sort addressed to popular prejudice. The Liturgy avoids the ambiguous phrase; and we will do so too; for the word regeneration is made to mean, sometimes one thing, and sometimes another, and it does not come in our way at all at present to discuss these meanings. We are only concerned, that no miserable logomachy of this sort shall be allowed to cheat us out of what the sacrament has been held to be in past ages; God's act, setting apart those who are the subjects of it to His service, and bringing them within the sphere of His grace in

order that they may be saved. We do not ask any one to call this regeneration; it may not suit at all his sense of the term; but we do most earnestly conjure all to hold fast to the thing, call it by what term they may. The question is simply, Doth baptism in any sense save us? That is, does it put us in the way of salvation? Has it anything to do at all with our deliverance from original sin, and our being set down in the new world of righteousness and grace, which has been brought to pass, in the midst of Satan's kingdom all around it, by our Lord Jesus Christ?

For the defence of the Liturgy it will be enough to place the matter now on the lowest ground. Our spiritualists admit that God *may* make baptism the channel of His grace—may cause the thing signified to go along with the outward sign, when He is pleased to do so; only they will not have it that His grace is in any way bound to the ordinance. Will they not admit then also, that the sacrament ought to be so used as to carry with it the benefit it represents; that God designed it to be in this way more than an empty form; and that it is the duty of all, therefore, to desire and expect through it what it thus, by Divine appointment, holds out to expectation? Who will be so bold as to say, in so many words, that baptism means no deliverance whatever from the power of sin, and that it is superstition to come looking for anything of this sort from it? Why then quarrel with the Liturgy for making earnest with the objective force of the sacrament in this view?

"You present this child here," it is said, "and do seek for him deliverance from the power of the Devil, the remission of sin, and the gift of a new and spiritual life by the Holy Ghost, through the Sacrament of Baptism, which Christ hath ordained for the communication of such great grace." Is it not true, that the sacrament has been ordained for that purpose, even if this be not exclusively or necessarily bound to its administration? If not, for what other purpose under heaven was it ordained? And if for this purpose, why should those who come to the ordinance, not come seeking what it holds out in this way to the view of faith? Are they to come seeking

nothing, expecting nothing, believing nothing? Or if otherwise, in the name of all common sense, tell us, O ye Gnostic dreamers, ye zealous contenders against formalities and forms, what then *are* they to seek?

The Liturgy, we allow, however, goes beyond this low view of the mere possibility of grace through the sacrament; it affirms that God, on His part, makes it to be always objectively just what it means. In other works, it teaches the reality of sacramental grace; and sees in it a birth-right title to all the blessings of the new covenant. This does not mean, that it regenerates or converts any one in the modern Methodistic sense of these terms; that it saves people by magic; or that it makes their final salvation sure in any way. Like Esau's birthright, it may be neglected, despised, parted with for a mess of pottage. But all this does not touch the question of its intrinsic value, in its own order; as being a real Divine gift and power of Sonship, nevertheless, in the family of God, for which all the treasures of the earth should be counted a poor and mean exchange.

On this subject of baptismal grace, then, we wlll enter into no compromise with the anti-liturgical theology we have now in hand. In seeking to make the Liturgy wrong, it has only shown itself wrong; and the more its errors are probed, the more are they found to be indeed, "wounds, and bruises, and putrefying sores." Starting with Pelagianism on one side, it lands us swiftly in downright Rationalism on the other. "It is impossible," says the distinguished French Reformed divine, Pressensé, in a late article, "to establish the necessity of infant baptism, except upon the ground that baptism imparts a special grace." We are most decidedly of the same opinion; and for this reason we denounce this theology as in reality, whatever it may be in profession, hostile to infant baptism, and unfriendly, therefore, to the whole idea of educational religion as this has been based upon it in the Reformed Church from the beginning. Without the conception of baptismal grace going along with the baptism of infants, there can be no room properly for confirmation; and the catechetical training which

is employed to prepare the way for this, may easily come then to seem a hinderance rather than a help, to the true conversion of the young to God. Then it will be well, if baptism fall not into general contempt, and so be brought to sink finally more and more into neglect altogether. To what a pass things have already come in this respect throughout our country, by reason of the baptistic spirit which is among us, and the general theological tendency we are now considering, we will not now take time to decide. Those who have eyes to see, can see for themselves.

IV. Office for the *Holy Communion.* The central character of this service, ruling as it ought to do the whole Order of worship to which it belongs, must make it of course specially objectionable to the anti-liturgical spirit with which we are now dealing.

Particular fault has sometimes been found with the consecratory prayer in the service, as teaching a real union between Christ and the elements representing His body and blood, differing altogether from the proper Reformed doctrine on this mysterious subject. A certain Doctor of Divinity went so far at Dayton as to say, that it amounted in full to the Roman Catholic dogma of transubstantiation. But in this the Doctor of Divinity was egregiously mistaken, as in many things besides. The doctrine of the Liturgy in that prayer is not Popish, and not Lutheran, but strictly Reformed. Not to be sure Reformed in the modern Puritan sense, in which too plainly this unliturgical spirit finds its familiar home; but Reformed in the old Calvinistic sense, as this entered into the symbols of the Reformed Church generally in the sixteenth century.

It is not true that this proper Reformed doctrine made the Lord's Supper to be only a commemorative ordinance, calling to mind the fact of His death. It made it to be this; but it made it to be also the medium of a realmystical communion with this glorified life. It saw in it, not a sign only, but a sacrament; the conjunction of visible elements with the invisible represented by them, in such sort that the presence of the one could be said to involve the presence also of the other—not

locally of course, but dynamically and with full virtue and effect —through the wonder-working power of the Holy Ghost. This we have abundantly shown years ago in our tract against Dr. Hodge, entitled, "The Doctrine of the Reformed Church on the Presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper;" an argument, which no one has ever yet pretended to meet, and whose historical force at least never can be overthrown; however convenient it may be for Puritanic divinity to go on repeating its traditionary song on this subject, as though history had nothing do with the matter whatever.

Now it is this old Reformed doctrine, we affirm, and no other, which is involved in the consecratory prayer of the Liturgy. Any one at all familiar with the Calvinistic terminology in regard to it, can see that it is faithfully followed at every point. It would be hard, indeed, to give the doctrine more succinctly or exactly in the same compass. God is called upon to "send down the powerful benediction of His Holy Spirit" upon the elements, "that being set apart now from a common to a sacred and mystical use, they may exhibit and represent" —these being the very terms made use of by Calvin to distinguish the Reformed doctrine from the Lutheran; may *exhibit* and *represent* "to us with true effect"—that is, not corporeally, and yet not simply in sign or shadow either, but with the energy of actual presence—"the Body and Blood of His Son, Jesus Christ; so that in the use of them"—mark again the distinction; not in the elements themselves outwardly considered, but in the use of them, that is, in the sacramental transaction, "we may be made, through the power of the Holy Ghost"—again the Calvinistic or Reformed qualification— "to partake really and truly of His blessed life, whereby only we can be saved from death, and raised to immortality at the last day."

In the face of all this, what are we to think of a Doctor of Divinity, who could stand up and say, that the Liturgy in this prayer teaches the doctrine of transubstantiation?

What are we to think of the same Doctor of Divinity, when we find him thrumming on the expression, "this memorial of

the blessed sacrifice of Thy Son," in the next following prayer; as though it said *memorial sacrifice*, and meant all that is held offensive in the Roman Catholic so called sacrifice of the mass! Alas, alas, for the Liturgy, in the hands of theological criticism so utterly untheological as this!

A truce, however, to these quibbles about particular terms. The real controversy here is with the Communion service as a whole; and it turns upon the sacramental doctrine which underlies it throughout, and which in this way conditions the universal sense of the Liturgy. This anti-liturgical theology, not centering in the Incarnation, not dwelling in the bosom of the Creed, having no sense for objective historical Christianity, and no sense for the Church, can have at the same time of course no sense for the sacramental in its true form. For what is a sacrament? The visible exhibition of an invisible grace—a mystery in this view, where the visible and invisible are brought together, and held together, not simply in man's thought, but in God's power, by a bond holding beyond nature altogether in the supernatural order of grace. Does Puritanism believe this? Not at all. It will know no sacrament, save in the intelligible form of a sign, which simply represents and calls to mind what God does for men spiritually, and on the outside of the sacrament altogether. We have just seen what becomes of the Sacrament of Baptism in the hands of this spiritualistic scheme. And now it is only what might be expected, to find it bent on taking away our Lord from us after the same fashion, in the Holy Eucharist.

The Liturgy stands as a protest and defence against this sacrilege. It gives us the true Reformed view of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper, in a form answering at the same time to the faith and worship of the Primitive Church. It teaches, that the Lord's Supper is more than an outward sign, and more than a mere calling to mind of our Saviour's death as something past and gone. It teaches, that the value of Christ's sacrifice never dies, but is perennially continued in the power of His life. It teaches, that the outward side of the sacrament is mystically bound by the Holy Ghost to its inward

invisible side; not fancifully, but really and truly; so that the undying power of Christ's life and sacrifice are there, in the transaction, for all who take part in it with faith. It teaches, that it is our duty to appropriate this grace, and to bring it before God (the "memorial of the blessed sacrifice of His Son"), as the only ground of our trust and confidence in His presence. All this the Liturgy teaches. Who will say that it wrongs, in doing so, the sacramental doctrine of the Reformed Church? Are we then to have no sacraments? Must we plunge into the full abyss of Rationalism?

We now stop. Our general task is done. Enough has been said, to show how things stand between the New Liturgy and its theological opposers. We are willing to submit the case to the common intelligence of our churches. Even the West must yet come, we think, to see eye to eye here with the East. To the people at large we say: Look now on this picture, and now on that; and judge ye for your own selves, which of these theological schemes may be safest and best for the German Reformed Church to take to her bosom at the present time.

Art. III.—FALSE FAITH AND FEELING IN REGARD TO THE HOLY GHOST.

BY D. GANS, D.D., NORRISTOWN, PA.

There is a style of theological thinking and feeling prevalent, which, complacently enough, regards itself as pre-eminently spiritual, and in this view specially orthodox likewise, because it substitutes the Holy Spirit in the room and place of Christ, and makes every thing, in the whole range of experimental and practical Christianity, to turn upon this fact. Of course, it makes no account of the Church, as in any true sense, the real body of Christ, nor of the Sacraments, as the actual bearers of His life and grace. The present, as persons adopting this theory are led to say, is the dispensation of the Spirit; and the sealing ordinances, if they communicate any thing, communicate the Spirit, and never, in any sense, the humanity, of Christ. This latter is ruled out, as something low and carnal, if not sensual, and altogether worldly and wicked. For the most part, in the view of this faith and feeling, Holy Baptism only recognizes and confirms grace already at hand, by some means, not clearly defined, while the Holy Supper of our Lord only deepens and fortifies it, by directing the thoughts and feelings, in an impressive way, by means of symbols appealing to the senses (which, too, ought to be carnal and sensual), to the intense agony of Christ upon the Cross. Its claim for spirituality, as thus made, rests upon the fact, mainly, if not entirely, that it ignores the presence of the human, and will hear of nothing but the spiritual in its abstract and naked form. Thus, it makes every thing that is real, for man to be purely spiritual, and hence, invisible. For the outward, the visible, the organized it has, by necessity, but little reverence or regard. It views this, on the other hand, rather as the "letter that killeth."

Now, at first view, such claim may strike the mind as being well founded. It is not able, however, to bear the test of true and earnest criticism. Spiritual such thinking may indeed be, and certainly is; but the truly spiritual, as arising out of the constitution of nature and of Christianity, and answering to these, it evidently is not. The outward and the inward, whether in the facts of nature or of the institutions of Grace, are not abstractly sundered; nor could the one ever be what it is, were it to stand dissociated from, and unmodified by, the other. They are always, internally and mysteriously, bound together; they interpenetrate each other at every point, in a sense which no anyalysis can fully reveal; so that what either is in fact, it is on the ground of the relation which it bears to the other. The one may, indeed, by a wilful effort of the mind, be abstracted from the other, and made thus an interest for man in itself; but can such a view, or any system based upon such a view, represent correctly the truth as God made it? Manifestly, it cannot. Such thinking, with all its claims to superior spirituality, has clearly no counterpart in the way of actual, living fact. It is a shadow, without a corresponding real object producing it. It is a transcendentalism—an idealism—an abstraction—a wilful breaking away from the actual thing which God made, and an attempt, from the bosom of its own genius, to create a world of a better and higher order than the one in which we live. It is very true, that the outward form, when thus abstractly sundered from the inward spirit, is a dead, unmeaning thing. But this is what God, manifestly, never made. It is equally true, also, that the inward spirit, when separated in the same way from the outward form, is an unsubstantial, airy, and ghostly being, which is far more unnatural, and, to the same extent, unmeaning for man.

No theoretic thinking, that does not, in a real way, correspond with the object of thought beyond itself, can be true. Much less can it be true, if, to sustain itself, it must disrupt the organic unity of God's works, and then catch up the *disjecta membra*, on either side, and exhibit each as complete in itself. To separate the divine side from the human, in the Holy Scrip-

tures, and then seize only the first, might, indeed, give what many call a spiritual view of the Word of God; but the Word of God, being in its constitution divine *and* human, it would not, manifestly, be the true view. The person of Christ is, in like manner, divine and human. To exhibit the divine, as separated from the human, is the spiritual again, under a false and delusive form. The same is true of the Church and Sacraments. Here, also, the truly spiritual, answering to the fact, is the divine and human in sacramental union. The outward and the inward, the human and divine, are mysteriously united, throughout the whole new creation in Christ Jesus; even God Himself, for man, is in Christ; and the true spiritual view of the whole, and of the parts, is not that which abstracts the last from the first, and then regards it as full and complete in this isolated form, but that which conceives both in union, with whatever modification this union may involve for each. This is the most spiritual thinking, because it lies in the bosom of the thing itself thought of. It is just *as* spiritual as the object itself is spiritual. Any thing above or beyond this, or more spiritual than this, must, in the nature of the case, be false and unreal, whatever boasts it may make of greater elevation or superior spirituality.

This false spirituality affects to make superior account, especially of the Holy Spirit. But in this respect, no less than in others, it frequently betrays its own weakness and false nature. Whatever stress it may be led to lay upon the substitution of the Spirit, in the place of the life and grace of Christ, it is worthy of note, that it scarcely ever rises above the degrading conception of a *means* to an *end*. While it looks with great earnestness upon the Spirit as a *means*, leading to the salvation of the Gospel, it is seldom that it conducts the soul to Him, as a direct object of worship. With all its boasted elevation, does it not here again actually fall below the demand, which arises from the true conception of the Holy Ghost? Is He a person, or is He a mere influence? The neuter pronoun *it*, by which the Spirit is often designated by this style of thinking, betrays the low feeling which is the basis of this pretended superior

spirituality. The whole conception, so far as it deserves this term, floats loosely in the bosom of a careless vagueness, which, while it disdains to make any earnest account of the proper form, as something degrading and carnalizing, loses sight altogether, in the end, of the actual substance, after which it aimed in the beginning. Where is the room, thus, for actual, positive homage, such as is paid to the Father and the Son? At this point we may say, indeed, begins the whole cluster of false conceptions in regard to Christianity under this form. Let the true nature and work of the Holy Ghost be misunderstood, or confused, and the entire view of the Gospel system must be disjointed and chaotic. For this reason, many begin in the Spirit, only, however, to end in the flesh. The false idea of the spiritual first rules out every thing that is human, as something foreign and degrading to its own nature, by substituting for it the Spirit, and then actually ignores the Spirit Himself, by substituting an influence in the place of His own true and proper personality, thus ending, from whatever height it began, in the flesh. Let us notice here, somewhat more definitely, some of the forms of false faith and feeling, especially in regard to the Holy Ghost.

The Holy Trinity—Three in One, and One in Three—is the great difficulty in the way of all purely rationalistic thinking; and to get rid of this, to break it down, or in some way to drive it out of the consciousness of men, has been the great effort of unbelief. To accomplish this end, the attack, sometimes, has been made upon the Son, the Second Person in the Trinity, as in the case, particularly, of Ebionism, which was designed, of course, to reach, in due time, the Holy Spirit, also, with the same fatal effect. Whether this prolific heresy be viewed in the transition period, from Judaism to Christianity, as connected directly with the Ebionites, or in the latter part of the third and the beginning of the fourth centuries, connected with Arius, or in the sixteenth, connected with Socinus, or in the present, as embodied in Unitarianism—in every phase, and at every period, it involves such a predominance of the human, as to leave no room properly for a divine personality in Christ.

In every aspect, however exalted His character, and divine His mission, it has denied all claim to personal divinity, and reduced Him to the level of a mere creature. This is one way, in which the unbelieving mind has sought to undermine the doctrine of the Trinity, as presented in the Scriptures, and to rid itself of what, by mere rational analysis, it cannot understand; and it is easy to perceive that the same false idea of spirituality, regarding the real union of the divine with the human as something unnatural, if not an impossibility, plainly constitutes the deepest ground of the fatal heresy.

To accomplish the same end, the attack has been still more directly aimed at the personality of the Holy Spirit. For reasons, which may be referred to at a more advanced stage of this article, it has been felt, that this was a more vulnerable side of the general doctrine of the Trinity; and the efforts made in this view, carry with them, accordingly, on this account, a peculiar boldness and confidence.

Perhaps the most general way of disposing of the subject, in this view, has been to resolve the whole conception of the Holy Ghost into a vague impersonal influence, or undefined and mysterious potency. Of course, the direct object here has been to get rid of every thing like proper personality. However powerful this influence, and however divine in its general nature, it is never allowed to involve the idea of a separate and distinct personal being. This feeling is willing, indeed, to concede much in the way of divine origin and dignity, but denies personal nature, as distinguished from the Father, and resolves all into the idea of a Power in, through and above nature.

The notions entertained in regard to the precise character of this Power, or Influence, vary according to the forces which are conceived to enter into and compose it. Perhaps the lowest view of its nature is that, which regards it as the general comprehension of human feeling, more or less awake to the spiritual, the pure, and the good. It is the *breath* of *God* (Gen. ii. 7), which became the vital spirit of *man* in the act of original creation. Every man, who is at all cognizant of the inward states of his own mind and heart, must acknowledge the presence

of internal motions which tend, not only to the pure and the good, lying beyond the mere world of sense, but also the infinite and absolute. Reason itself is so constituted as, by the nature of its own being, to involve the infinite and absolute, although it may have no power to reach these in a strictly logical way. It is found practically, that just as the inner man wakes to a true sense of its nature and destiny, does its struggles become earnest to break away from the simply limited and relative, and rise to the infinite and absolute. Every effort at physical, mental, and moral improvement, illustrates and confirms the innate tendency to rise above the imperfect to the perfect. The ultimate ideal, in some form, is ever before man; and his power to perceive this, and struggle after it, is evidence of an inward spiritual nature, which relates him to God. From the deepest depths of human consciousness there sounds a continuous voice expressive of a want, which can only be met and satisfied in the absolute and perfect. Though sin has entered the reason, pervaded all the mental and moral faculties, perverting their energy and covering all with moral darkness, still the root of man's spiritual nature remains. There still lingers a sure instinctive feeling after God. In no condition, while he lives, is man a devil. Though far removed from his full normal state and proper home, he yet longs and labors, however darkly and feebly, after both; and the dissatisfaction left in his bosom, at every additional attainment, proves that nothing short of God can give rest and quietude to the soul.

These inward feelings thus generally expressed, struggling darkly and mysteriously after the perfectly true, and beautiful and good, which lie beyond them, are called the Holy Ghost. The whole conception, in this view, is individual and subjective, and rises not above nature, or the divine which is peculiar to nature in the form of its original creation. The Spirit is different in each individual, according to the normal differences of constitution, and the degrees of mental and moral improvement; but in no case is it allowed, that the Holy Ghost has a distinct personal being independent of this subjective experience. Here the case is reversed, as compared with the first form of false Spi-

rituality. Instead of regarding the Spirit, as some thing wholly abstract and separated from the natural, it makes the natural to be the Spirit.

Answering to this view of the Holy Spirit in the sphere of the pure and good, we find a very similar conception of the nature of Satan in the sphere of the evil and depraved. The one view is the measure of the other; and the boldly avowed presence of the latter proves the latent and concealed existence of the former. Satan, or the Evil Spirit, is nothing more, according to the same theory, than the general comprehension of the personal wicked feelings, which men also experience as at war with those that are pure and good. Man is both his own good and bad spirit; and beyond such individual feelings, resulting in certain tendencies, which point and urge upward in the one case, and downward in the other, there is not supposed to exist, either a personal Holy Spirit, or a personal Devil. The theory ends where it begins—in pure Naturalism.

By others the Holy Spirit is made to consist in the power which is felt to pervade society in a more general way, urging it to strive after the spiritual and true which lie beyond it. This is a broader view than the other, if not higher. It goes beyond the mere individual, and comprehends all the objective forces peculiar to man, corresponding to the subjective capacities for them, which individuals realize by means of their intuitive consciousness. These constitute the moral foundation of society—the forces which prevent moral decay and death, and which keep the general eye and heart always turned more or less intelligently towards interests of a higher and more spiritual nature than any which have yet been attained; though these interests be not properly above or beyond, but in the undeveloped resources of nature as such. These forces are the life of all social virtues. They prompt to humanity, benevolence, and charity. They lead individuals, beyond the narrow and selfish feelings of their own nature, to take interest in a higher and more general good. All public institutions, whether designed for the physical, civil or moral benefit of man, look more or less directly, always ultimately, to these spiritual forces, which mys-

teriously pervade the whole of society. This is the spirit that lies back of all governments, and constitutes the basis on which they rest. The concealed, but restless energy underlying Science, Art, Philosophy, constituting the great world-spirit, moving through and over all changes, fashioning by its plastic hand the world of matter and mind, and giving to each factor the power to raise humanity into higher regions of thought and feeling, causing it ever to tend, by an irrepressible necessity, towards the ideal good which towers above it, is taken to be the same as the Holy Spirit. It is the general spirit of enterprise, development, and progress in the bosom of society, under its universal form. However divine the ultimate source of this widespread, all-comprehending, and controlling power, and whatever supernatural elements it may be conceded to involve, and still further, however objective it may be acknowledged to be as it regards all individuals or segments of society, as well as all periods or epochs of time, it is still fairly the outgrowth of nature as such, and is strictly impersonal, both in its being and operation. It never comes forward in the form of a distinct personal being; but beyond it, according to the false feeling here had in view, there is no other Holy Ghost.

There is still another view of the Holy Spirit, which, while it is more elevated than the preceding, must nevertheless be regarded as equally defective and false: it is the view that resolves the Holy Ghost into an *attribute* of God, giving Him the same relation to the Divine Being as Power, or Wisdom. This notion is based upon such passages of Scripture as the following, and others of like character: Isa. viii. 11, Jer. xv. 17, Ezek. i. 3, iii. 14, in which the *hand* of the Lord, representing *power*, is put for the Holy Spirit. This form of the heresy in reference to the Spirit was held by some in a very early period of the Christian Church, before the doctrine of His true nature had become clearly developed and firmly established. Indeed, it may be said to have silently pervaded, with more or less conditioning power, the whole structure of Monarchianism previous to the full and clear development of the true doctrine of the Trinity. Lactantius and others explained the Holy Ghost as

being the sanctifying *energy* of the Father and of the Son. The Patripassionists spoke of Him as the *operation* of God. In any case, the subordination of the Spirit to the Father and the Son, at least to the degree to which it was thought necessary to carry this principle, made it difficult, if not impossible, to admit the full idea of personality as inhering in Him.

The numerous sects of Gnostics, who sought to corrupt the simple faith of the Gospel during the first three centuries, held both Christ and the Spirit to be Aeons, simple emanations from the Supreme Mind. Denying the divine origin of the books of Moses, they distinguished between the Aeon which had inspired him and the prophets, and the Aeon whom God sent forth after the ascension of Christ, making the first very inferior to the last, and regarding it as much farther removed from the Supreme Being. With a view to oppose the error of the Gnostics, there was inserted in the creed of the Church at Jerusalem, which was honored throughout the East as the mother of all the Churches, in addition to the original words, "I believe *εις το αγιον πνευμα*," the following, "*το παρακλητον, το λαλησαν δια των προφητων.*" Cyril, who was Bishop of Jerusalem in the fourth century, with a view still more effectually to break the power of these fatal heresies, wrote an exposition of the Creed of which these words are a part; and further, ordered that all the catechumens should repeat it before they were received to Holy Baptism.

The false notions which obtained thus early, in regard to the nature of the Holy Ghost, were not wholly dissipated by the clearer light which was afterwards made to beam upon the subject. Though variously modified, and, in some respects, mitigated, they, nevertheless, continued to live in history; and every subsequent age has been made, more or less seriously, to feel their blighting effects. In the sixteenth century, these early errors seemed again to have ripened in the mind of Socinus, who, accordingly, with great boldness, proclaimed that the Holy Ghost was not a person, but only a *power*, or *energy*, of God. Nor does the present, in this regard, differ substantially from the past. Wherever the difficulty exists, to con-

cede full personality to the Spirit, whether in the case of individuals or communities, whether in the way of feeling or faith, there lies the poison, latent, it may be, of this same original heresy. To call the Holy Ghost an attribute simply, of the Father, or an energizing Aeon or virtue, emanating from the Father and the Son, is a direct denial of His true and proper Being. Any views which fail to give Him an original, and essential, and personal relation to the Godhead, much more so all views which regard Him as being the Mode merely, in which God manifests His Power, Wisdom, Goodness, and Love, rest in, and arise, more or less directly, from these ancient heresies respecting His true Personality.

But the difficulty here does not hold, in the idea of Personality only. This may be fully conceded, and yet immense room be left for error of a radical and fatal character. Nor has this room been left unoccupied. The personality of the Holy Ghost may be granted, but its divinity denied, in which case the error is, in no sense, mitigated or lessened. This form of the heresy is also old, and comes down through the ages, bearing the same withering power. The theory of Arius, while it referred with more directness to the Son, comprehended, also, the Spirit. As Arius regarded the Son as a *creature* of God, in a very elevated and noble sense, it is true, but still a *mere* creature, so he regarded the Holy Ghost as being the first created nature from the Son, placing the same distance between the Son and the Spirit, which he imagined to exist between the Son and the Father. The Holy Ghost, in this view, which fully conceded His personality, was, nevertheless, only the creature of a creature. To honor the Holy Ghost truly requires, therefore, not only that we concede to Him a full and distinct Personality, corresponding with that of the Father and the Son, but also that we recognize clearly the Divinity of this Personality; that we acknowledge it as holding in the same divine essence, pervading the other two persons in the Godhead, on the ground of which He is, at the same time, truly one within them.

In the view only of this objective Divine Personality, whose glorious mystery, from its own sublime heights, appeals to our

faith, can we be in a condition truly to worship the Holy Ghost as we worship the Father and the Son. The deficiency of any essential feature in the object of our homage, as this stands out of us and above us, independently of our own subjective states, will, to that extent, disqualify us inwardly, to render the worship and homage which are demanded at our hands. We, in our faith and feeling, can never go beyond the Divine objective facts of revelation. As these are, so will our faith and feeling be; for these last, to be true and commensurate, must be begotten and penetrated by the first. Any heresy, therefore, of a serious or fatal character, that may be entertained in regard to the Holy Ghost, must have the effect of concealing His true and full Person as an object of divine homage, and to this extent, of destroying, also, our power to render such homage. This want of power freely to bow to and worship the Holy Ghost, becomes, in this way, a sure evidence of the presence of some vitiating heresy in reference to His Person. That the past erroneous theories, in regard to the Holy Spirit, have projected their image into the Christian mind of the present, is shown in the fact, that the Spirit is not as directly and fully an object of Divine worship, as is the Father and the Son. Much account, indeed, is made of His agency in the general system of redemption, as the medium of spiritual illumination and grace; but the feeling that leads the soul to Him, directly in the way of earnest, profound worship, is, manifestly, very defective. There is here, clearly, a misgiving in the Christian consciousness itself, extending farther than is generally believed, and which is even more destructive of the feeling of true worship than individuals themselves are ready to own to their own minds. The same is true, to a great extent, in the public service of the sanctuary. The glorious old Doxologies, which couple the Spirit with the Father and the Son, to be equally praised and adored, are not sung with the same heart as in former periods of the Christian Church. It must be confessed that, even where these ancient heresies do not form themselves into bold and distinct theories, leading to an intellectual antagonism to the Divine Personality of the Holy Ghost, their secret

and unconscious poison is, nevertheless, present to a very fearful extent, vitiating the devout spirit of worship, by modifying the original courage of faith. Feeling and Faith, in this regard, which have fallen into a false state, in consequence of the intervention of the heresies now indicated, can only be restored again to their true and normal character by being confronted with the full Divine Personality of the Holy Ghost, standing forth in the entire glory of His Being, proceeding from the Father and the Son, but, at the same time, co-equal and co-eternal with both.

One reason why the attack upon the Holy Trinity has been directed, as we have now seen, especially against the Spirit, lies in the close relation which the Scriptures make to hold between the Paraclete and the Father and Son. Being the same in essence, it is thought that He must be also the same in Person; at least the difference in Person which the Scriptures proclaim, must, it is argued, for the purpose of avoiding contradiction, so yield and be explained, as to amount, in the end, to a mere modal, or outwardly formal difference; and hence, whatever apparent difference the Scriptures may attach to the Spirit's operations, as distinguished from the Father, they are all readily resolved into different *modes* of Divine Being, through which the *same* Person operates. This is thought to be a vulnerable point, and, therefore, it is selected as the point of attack.

But it is forgotten, that the sameness of essence is itself, even in the view of reason, a necessary condition for the distinction of Person, if that Person is to be divine; for if the essence of the Holy Ghost were different from that of the Father, His Personality, however triumphantly made out, could not be a divine Personality, any more than that of angels or of men. While the Trinity is one in essence, it is also three in Person; and on this account, there must necessarily, be not only a very close relationship in the way of Being, but also in the acts which flow from them respectively. Unity of essence, and consequent harmony of operation, constitute no reason why the Holy Ghost should be less distinctively personal than the Father

and the Son. But the case itself constrains the reason to take even a farther step, and say, not only that this unity of essence is the necessary condition of the divinity in this Personality, but necessitates just that difference which is expressed by Personality itself. But for such *difference*, the *unity* could not be conceived. The first is for the reason, the only testimony of the last, in the same way that the last involves for the reason, the necessity of the first; and it is, on this account, precisely, that God is always presented to the mind in the form of Trinity,

Another reason for the attack upon the Trinity at this point, lies in the fact, that the Holy Ghost is represented in the Word of God as a pure Spirit, wholly supersensible and invisible. The terms Father and Son carry in their forms the idea of Personality. In the case of the Holy Ghost, this is not, at first view, so palpable. It has been thought easier, on this account, to attack personality here, than in the case of the Son; and it has been confidently hoped that, if at this apparently more vulnerable point, an entrance of the wedge could be secured, such would be the gain, in the way of logical power, that even the idea of Personality, in the case of the Son, in spite of all the apparently substantial ground on which it rests, would be forced back into non-being, or, at least, be so far removed from the Divine, as to make it exist in the form of the human only. But close investigation shows, that this point is no less carefully and absolutely guarded than the other. The reason on which the effort is based, will not sustain it, much less its conclusion. The Father is no less a pure Spirit than the Holy Ghost. "God is a Spirit" (St. John iv: 24); and if on this account the Holy Ghost must be impersonal, then it follows that the Father must be impersonal likewise; and we are thus landed at once into the dismal region of Atheism. Angels, also, are spirits, and so, likewise, are saints in their intermediate disembodied state; and yet we do not for a moment think, on this account, of ignoring their distinctive personal natures. The premises, therefore, are too sweeping, involving, through the force of the logical inference, the destruction of even what

the objector, in his consciousness, maintains as true; hence, the objection itself falls. Spirit, as such, does not preclude the possibility of Personality. On the other hand, it is clear that Personality cannot be conceived of without Spirit. It grows not out of the flesh; nor does it, in any sense, find its basis in the body. It is always the herald of the spirit, in whatever form it may reside; and the Paraclete, being a pure Spirit, carries in Him, in this view, the highest and most absolute conditions of Personality. Indeed, we cannot conceive of a spirit, in any true sense, without carrying along with the conception the idea of Personality also; for the two, by their own natures, inhere in each other.

Still another reason for the attack of the Trinity, at this point, has been found in the fact, that the Holy Ghost is frequently spoken of by inspired writers as being, seemingly, of the *same nature* as impersonal influences. For instance, He is called *breath*. "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the *breath* of life; and man became a living soul" (Gen. ii: 7). True Exegesis, it is said, requires the word Breath, in this connection, to mean Spirit; the Spirit of God, or the Holy Spirit; and the inference thus prepared is, that because *breath*, in its ordinary acceptation, is something impersonal, therefore the Holy Ghost, whose nature it is, must also be impersonal. So, likewise, in St. John xx: 22, where, after the resurrection of Christ, He is said to have met His disciples in the upper room at Jerusalem, and *breathed* on them, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Breath and Spirit are plainly two names, or designations of the Holy Ghost; but it is impossible for any one clearly to know to what extent the first is the essence of the second, or to what precise degree the first is the figure of the last. The last, clearly, is His proper name, while the first may be entirely metaphorical; or if it herald the essence, which is common to the Trinity alike, then it only the more fully, as we have seen before, proclaims the fact, which it is here used to disprove; for unity of essence implies and necessitates diversity of personality. Both these terms are brought in direct contrast in Job

xxxiii: 4: "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the Breath of the Almighty hath given me life." Here it is plain that while Breath, as a mere metaphor, is impersonal, yet, in its metaphorical significance, it involves, in the very deepest sense, the idea of Personality. It is Breath giving or in-breathing life, which comprehends the whole spiritual and ethical being of man, which is not in the power certainly of any mere influence, as such, to impart, and outside of which there is no room even for the conception of Personality, either as it regards God or man; for personality can hold only in a living and intelligent being, whether that being be man or God.

Then it has been imagined that the comparisons which are frequently instituted between the Holy Ghost and, for instance, the wind, as in St. John iii: 8, and a dove, as in St. Mark i: 10, and fire, as in Acts ii: 3, etc., would greatly aid the attack upon the Trinity at this point. But here, also, the fond hope has been disappointed. *Likeness* not only implies but requires *difference* at the same time. To be *like* the wind, or *as* the fire, or *similar* to the dove, is not the same thing as *being* either wind, or fire, or dove; and until it can be shown that Christ, where in St. Matt. xii: 31, He said, "The kingdom of Heaven is *like to* a grain of mustard seed," meant that the kingdom of Heaven *is* a grain of mustard seed, there can certainly arise no valid argument, from this condescending mode of reasoning, against the Divine personal character of the Holy Ghost. While the Holy Spirit resembles these impersonal things, He is, at the same time, by the very necessity of the *resemblance*, different from them; and the difference lies just in what these things have not, viz: *Personality*, a Divine Personality, in which He is God, co-eternal with the Father and the Son, and equally to be worshipped and adored. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost.

To the eternal Three,
In will and essence One;
To Father, Son, and Spirit be
Co-equal honors done.

Thus we have sought, negatively, to open the way for the positive proof of the Divine Personality of the Holy Ghost, which we may endeavor to furnish in some subsequent issue.

ART. IV.—THE SACRAMENTAL AND EXPERIMENTAL IN THE MYSTICAL UNION.

PROF. T. G. APPLE, A. M., OF MERCERSBURG COLLEGE, PA.

The sacred Scriptures clearly teach, that there is a most intimate and real union between Christ and His people. The terms employed to characterize this union seem to exhaust human language, and even then to leave something beyond, which cannot be adequately expressed, but can only be embraced by faith. His people are said to be *in* Christ, and He *in* them. Their life is hid *with* Christ *in* God. "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." John xiv. 20. It is not necessary here to multiply passages to the same effect. Equally clear and forcible are the figures, or analogies, employed in Scripture to set forth this intimate union. It is compared to that, which holds between the vine and the branches, to the union between husband and wife, between the head and the members of the body, between Adam and his posterity. Yet it is evident, that no analogy of this kind in nature can be regarded as adequate to measure that, which it illustrates for our comprehension. Nature is a shadow, a similitude, of the supernatural, but on this account, instead of being able to bring before us the full measure of that which it thus resembles, it can only afford a help to lay hold of it by faith. The union must ever be regarded as a glorious mystery which we may believe, but can never fully comprehend with the mere understanding.

The reader will notice a peculiarity in the passage of Scripture bearing on this subject above quoted. "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you."

It would be a great mistake, we think, to suppose, that these two expressions, "*ye in me*," and, "*I in you*," mean one and the same thing,—that the latter only repeats the meaning of the former. In the words of men such repetition is often found, an addition of words without an addition of meaning; but in the words of Christ we can expect no such tautology. His words are uttered with infallible precision. Besides, this is not the only passage, in which these two forms of expression are employed to designate this two-fold relation between Christ and His members. In the 15th chap. and 8th verse of St. John, we have the same thing: "I am the vine, ye are the branches; He that abideth *in me*, and *I in him*, the same bringeth forth much fruit." Throughout the New Testament these two sides of the relation are continually brought out in similar forms of expression.

Although the Scriptures do not deal in logical formulas, or scientific statements, yet it will be found that, in setting forth this reciprocal relation of Christ and His people, the expression, *in Christ*, usually refers to the objective grace, which Christians inherit by being brought into this relation to Christ, and not so much the subjective experience of it. For instance, when it is said, "ye are complete *in Him*," we are not to understand that these Christians had as yet arrived at a state of completeness in their own subjective growth and perfection, but rather that they possessed *germinally*, or *potentially*, *in* Christ the full perfection of their true regenerated manhood. Here must be classed also all those passages, though the phraseology may be varied, in which Christians are said already to have and possess, all that is comprehended in the work of their salvation. They are said to be dead with Christ, to be buried with Him, to be quickened together with Him, to be raised up with Him, to be dead to the law by the body of Christ, to be married to Him, in that significant word of St. Paul, to be apprehended of Christ Jesus, as precedent and necessary to their apprehending Him. In all such passages, reference is had to what they have as an inheritance by virtue of a relation into which they have been brought to Christ. And the exhortations contained in the New

Testament Epistles generally are based upon the assumed presence of the power and grace flowing from this relation, to enable them to go forward, in the way of obedience and newness of life, towards the attainment of all that was included in their calling. "For ye were sometime darkness, but now are ye light *in* the Lord: walk as children of the light." Eph. v. 8. "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above." Col. iii. 1.

On the other hand, the expression, *Christ in you*, will be found generally to set forth the subjective work of grace in man, relating more to experience, to faith, to sanctification, &c. "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints, &c." Eph. iii. 7. "Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Gal. ii. 20. Of course we do not mean to affirm, that these different forms of expression are always used with strict reference to the distinction here referred to. The Scriptures rather set forth truth in its living, concrete, form, where the objective and subjective continually flow together. But the distinction is sufficiently marked, often assumed where it is not expressed, to show that it is not a mere idle fancy or theory. We proceed, then, in the use of the passage quoted from St. John, to examine the nature of this relation, as setting forth two different sides in the work of our salvation.

I. "YE IN ME." What is it to be *in Christ?*

We may be aided in understanding this by recurring to the analogy, which Christ furnishes in the 15th chap. of St. John. "I am the vine, ye are the branches." We know what it is for the branch to be in the vine: it is, to be joined *organically* to the vine. The relation is organic, not mechanical. A stone may be placed in a wall, and thus united with it; but the union is an outward, not an inward one. The stone, by being placed in the wall, is not changed from what it was before; and if it be taken out again, it remains unaffected. The branch is related more intimately to the vine: it is made one with it by the power of a common life. If it is sundered from the vine, it is no longer what it was before. It withers, and dies, and returns to its primary elements.

Or, if we would have another analogy, it is furnished in one already referred to, employed also in the Scriptures, viz: the relation of his descendants to Adam, the natural head of the human race. In what sense are we in Adam? Evidently in the sense of being organically related to him. The human race is an organic whole, bound together by a common life.* "Thus especially, in an eminent sense, the first Adam is exhibited always to our view under a two-fold character. In one respect he is simply *a* man, to be counted as one amongst men since born, his sons. In another, he is *the* man; in whose person was included the whole human race. Thus he bears the name (in Hebrew) of the race itself; and it is under this generic title particularly, that he is presented to our notice in the sacred history of the Bible. His individual personality was, of course, limited wholly to himself. But a whole world of like separate personalities lay involved in his life, at the same time, as a generic principle or root. And all these, in a deep sense, form at last but one and the same life. Adam lives in his posterity, as truly as he has ever lived in his own person. They participate in his whole nature, soul and body, and are truly bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh."

The Scriptures, as already intimated, do not formally teach metaphysical theories, but the theory that, in this analogy, there is a generic race-life, that which we call humanity, and that this humanity is a real, though spiritual essence, and not a mere conception of the mind, is certainly assumed, in what is said of our sinning and falling in Adam. Such has been the understanding of the greatest, and wisest, and best, defenders of the doctrine of original sin in all ages, of Augustine, of Anselm, of Thomas Aquinas, and others. It is, moreover, the only interpretation on which this doctrine can be maintained without making God, in some way, the author of sin, or unjust in imputing to man that which is not his in fact. We will not insult the intelligence of our readers, by attempting its defence on the field of science or philosophy.

* Mystical Presence, p. 161.

Now, in their natural state, by their natural birth, men are not in Christ; they are in Adam, in the Adamic life, members of a fallen race. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." "For as in Adam all die, &c."—John, iii. 6. Rom. v. 12. 1 Cor. xv. 22. Hence it is necessary, that they should be engrafted, or incorporated, into Christ, in order that they may be in Him. They must be brought into a relation to Christ analogous to that between the branches and the vine, or to that which exists between the descendants of Adam and the natural head of the race. This act, by which the members of our fallen race are taken out of the old Adamic life, and incorporated in the second Adam, the true, absolute, head of our race, is an act of God in our behalf. We cannot do it ourselves. And this act of incorporation must be regarded as instituting a relation, without which there could be no saving work of grace in man. Here redemption for the individual begins. He who is not in Christ is dead; he has no ability to conform his life to the will of God, but lies under His condemnation. Just as the act of grafting precedes, and is a necessary condition to, the growth of the branch, and as natural birth is a fact precedent to the development of our sinful life, so our incorporation into Christ is a fact precedent and fundamental in our salvation.

We have said that our incorporation into Christ is an act of God in our behalf. It is performed by the Holy Ghost. It is His special office thus to mediate the life of Christ to those, who are introduced into His blessed kingdom. Thus far, we think, there can be no disagreement among orthodox Christians. We come now to inquire, as to the means employed by God in the performance of this act. Christianity is not magical in its operations. Means are employed, and conditions are necessary. We would naturally suppose that, as God has appointed means of grace in His Church for the bestowment of His benefits, so wonderful and mysterious an act as that by which we are incorporated into Christ by the Holy Ghost, would not be accom-

plished without any means. Already, in speaking to Nicodemus on the great mystery of the new birth, our Saviour gives the intimation, that the Holy Spirit would connect His work, in some way, with an outward sign. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John iii. 5. We do not mean to assert here, that this passage refers immediately and directly to baptism; but, that no reference to that sacrament, of any kind, is contained in it, we do not think can be maintained. We pass to the time, when the sacrament of baptism *was* instituted by Christ, and shall consider now its office or meaning in relation to this subject.

Let us notice first the words of the great commission given by Christ before He ascended up on high. "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Matt. xviii. 18—20. The work they were commissioned to perform is set forth in the word *μαθητεύσατε*, *make disciples of.* The English translation here is conceded to be incorrect, where it gives the same word, teach, that is afterwards given as the translation of another word. The means to be employed were twofold, 1. *βαπτίζοντες*, *baptizing*, 2. *διδάσκοντες*, teaching, or instructing.*

---

* One would suppose, that it was hardly necessary to quote authorities in a case, where the grammatical construction is so clear. Yet there are those, who labor to take away the emphasis and prominence, which is here given to baptism. We quote a few of such as we happen to have just at hand. "Thus we have here that great *commission* granted by Christ to His apostles and their successors, with respect to all nations (both Jews and Gentiles) embracing three particulars, *μαθητεῦειν*, *βαπτίζειν*, and *διδάσκειν*, i. e., 1. to disciple them, or convert them to the faith; 2. to initiate them into the Church by baptism; 3. to instruct them, when baptized, in the doctrines and duties of a Christian life."—Bloomfield.

"In the 19th verse there follows the important *institution of the Sacrament of* baptism. The words which directly refer to this institution, standing in the midst of the sentence, constitute, as it were, the very kernel of the command. Some have manifestly altogether misunderstood this passage, the *μαθητεύσατε*, as something which should precede baptism, as if the meaning of the words had been, '*first* in-

It is not implied, of course, that no instruction of any kind was to precede baptism. Evidently the disciples were to give sufficient instruction in regard to Christ to lead them to accept Him in His character as Saviour; but *that* instruction which is referred to in the commission was to follow, not precede, baptism. The first practical use of this commission is presented in the course Peter pursued on the day of Pentecost. His sermon was directed to show to the assembled multitudes, that Jesus was the Christ, promised in the Old Testament Scriptures, not to an explanation of the inner glorious mysteries of Christianity (which, as is known, were not exhibited, except to the baptized), and thus a presentation of their great guilt in crucifying Him. When they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter said unto them, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Here baptism is placed prominent as the first means, or initiatory rite of entrance into the Christian Church. The teaching them to observe *all things whatsoever* Christ commanded them, was certainly a subsequent work, as the epistles of the New Testament give abundant evidence. The conduct of Philip, in baptizing the Eunuch, is another example of the manner in which the disciples understood the commission, Acts viii. 26—40. Philip preached Jesus to the Eunuch in the chariot. He must evidently have intro-

---

struct, *then* baptize them'! But the grammatical construction does not warrant such a mode of interpretation, for the two participles, *βαπτίζοντες* and *διδάσκοντες*, are precisely what constitute the *μαθητεύειν*."—OLSHAUSEN.

"The *μαθητύειν* consists of two parts—the *initiatory*, admissory rite, and the *subsequent teaching*. It is much to be regretted, that the rendering of *μαθ.*, '*teach*,' has in our Bibles clouded the meaning of these important words. It will be observed, that, in our Lord's words, as in the Church, the process of ordinary discipleship is *from baptism to instruction*—i. e., is *admission in infancy to the covenant*, and *growing up into τηρεῖν πάντα, κ. τ. λ.*"—ALFORD.

"The nations are to be made *disciples of Christ*, or converted to Him by two means chiefly, viz., by *baptism* (*βαπτίζοντες*) and by religious instruction (*διδάσκοντες*)."—DR. SCHAFF. LANGE.

„Die Taufe sollte nicht ein Bekenntniß dessen seyn, was der Mensch schon empfangen hatte, sondern durch sie sollte die Gabe des h. Geistes mitgetheilt werden."—Gerlach.

duced the subject of baptism very soon; for as they were riding together, and came to a certain water, the Eunuch at once asked to be baptized. Upon the profession of his faith, *that Jesus Christ is the Son of God*, Philip baptized him.

The case of St. Paul is another instance. Paul had received no instruction, but remained in darkness three days. He was directed by Christ to go into Damascus, where he should receive instruction. When Ananias came to him, almost the first thing he told him was, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts xxii. 16. The case of the Jailer (Acts xvi.) is also in point. Baptism was administered to him in the night, just as soon as he accepted Christ as the Saviour of men. We may refer also to the baptizing of John's disciples (Acts xix.), as showing the meaning of baptism, as connected with the gift of the Holy Ghost.

If we turn now to those passages in the Epistles, in which baptism is spoken of, we shall find the same importance attached to baptism, as being that sacrament in which men are incorporated into Christ. "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into His death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Rom. vi. 3, 4. By baptism they are regarded here as being made one, incorporated with Christ in the objective facts of His death and resurrection; which facts, however, must become also living powers in their subjective experience, in their lives. "Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead." Col. ii. 12. A like reference this, not to the full development of their experience of the death and resurrection of Christ in their life, but the enjoyment of it by virtue of their union with Christ. They are said to be quickened *together with Christ;* that is, by virtue of their union with Him, they share in His resurrection. "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resur-

rection of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. iii. 21. Here, also, the power of the resurrection of Jesus Christ is said to be brought to us by baptism, not as consummated, as having reached its fruits, in our resurrection, but as including this in it. " . . But according to His mercy He saved us, by the laver of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." Tit. iii. 5.

The teaching of the early Church is a unit in regard to the import of baptism, and the Protestant symbols are full and clear. Indeed, the term ingrafted, or incorporated, is in most frequent use to designate the office of baptism.*

This is regarded as its meaning and force, that it is not a making over to us, in actual experience, the power of the life of Christ, but rather, that it places us in such relation to Christ, as that His life may now flow over into us. "To put on Christ in baptism, does, therefore, not merely mean the attainment of a righteousness, outwardly reckoned to us, a naked *justitia imputativa*, but it means to become partaker of the righteousness of Christ, as the substantial, fructifying principle of a new life in His Church. Only in this way, and in this sense, does baptism contain the true new birth, although we, in no way, teach by this that it effects a transubstantiation of the human nature, a one-sidedness, from which the Catholic Church cannot be pronounced free. For in teaching, that the righteousness of Christ is not only reckoned to the individual, but also appropriated to him, the Catholic Church apprehends the matter thus: she regards it as an immediate infusion of the

---

* In the Heidelberg Catechism, 70th question, it is said, we are renewed by the Holy Ghost, and sanctified to be *members* of Christ, &c. In the 74th question "they (children) must, by baptism, as a sign of the covenant, be also *admitted* (incorporated, einverleibt) into the Christian Church," which is the body of Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

"Luther's Smaller Catechism," question 92. *Where did the Holy Spirit begin this sanctification in you?* The Holy Spirit began this sanctification in me in holy Baptism.

Westminster Confession of Faith, chapter 28, sections 1 and 6.

"Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, *not only* for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church, *but also* to be unto him a sign and *seal* of the covenant of grace, of *his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins,* &c."

righteousness of Christ (*justitia infusa*), through which the nature of the individual is changed from a sinful into a pure and holy nature, so that original sin is not only broken in upon, but destroyed. In this way, a mechanical relation takes place, instead of an organic one, and instead of establishing an essential communion with Christ, baptism is thought to effect a transubstantiation of the nature of the child. The fault of this magical conception consists in this, that it applies the categories of the sensible actuality where it ought to apply the categories of the essence. If, therefore, we say that, in baptism, a real immanence of the nature of Christ and of human nature, a mysterious oneness of His holy essence and the sinful essence of man, is brought about, we also, on the other hand, hold fast to the idea, that this is not to be regarded as an immanence, finished and immediate, but one endless *beginning*. In that Christ, as the unseen *Head*, stands in an inward, indissoluble relation to the Church, as His mystical body: *i. e.*, that total organization of souls which has its point of personal unity in Him, receives the power of life from Him, through it, renews and animates itself, and the members of which are all His organs—He, by means of baptism, causes this universal organic relation to become effectual in each single new point of life which he appropriates to Himself and His Kingdom. As he continues His life through the Church, as a whole, so He also continues it through this particular mode of individual life, and, therefore, makes Himself the true beginning of life to it. The human nature is thus not changed, but the child, by means of baptism, is constituted Christ's *organ*. The righteousness of Christ is not infused into the infant's life immediately, but is, in its fruitfulness, turned over upon the infantile life of the child. The infantile life is made the unconscious *bearer* of the objective righteousness of Christ, the heavenly ideal of human nature, to use an expression of Churchly antiquity, becomes a Christophoros, a Christ-bearer."*

---

* Christian Baptism, and the Baptistic Question, by Dr. Martensen, translated by Dr. H. Harbaugh, Mercersburg Review, 1853.

May we not, then, say that we are ingrafted, or incorporated, into Christ by *Christian Baptism?* To be *in Christ*, is to be introduced into this relation by baptism. The act, as our natural birth, in which we are constituted members of fallen humanity, is an act in which we are not active, but passive. We submit to it in faith, it is true, though in the case of the child, there can be no *active* submission even; but still, it is God's act towards us, whereby we are taken out of the old Adamic nature, held under the power of the devil, and inserted into redeemed humanity in Christ. We are not unaware that, in the Heidelberg Catechism, it is incidentally said that we are ingrafted into Christ by a true faith.* It must be borne in mind, however, that this instruction is given to one already baptized, concerning which baptism the catechism teaches, that *it* is the means of incorporation into the Church of Christ. Faith here, evidently, is to be regarded as the condition, not the means, of ingrafting into Christ. For, how can faith, which is a human act, perform that which is an act of God to us? We may say, therefore, that it is not by repentance, not by faith, not by prayer, not by any thing we do, that this relation is brought about. It is an act of God, performed in our behalf, which is deeper than all experience, nay, is the ground and source of all Christian experience, because it is an act by which the centre of our life is poised in Christ, as the Head of a new race. Faith is necessary as a condition; for baptism cannot be properly administered, where it is resisted by unbelief. The child stands in the warm bosom of the faith of the Church which, through its parents or sponsors, is pledged in its behalf. To exclude the child from the reception of this great grace, because it has not conscious faith, is to say that sin can abound where grace cannot abound, in opposition to the assertion of the Apostle, that where sin abounds, grace does much more abound.

Neither can we say, that the *word* is the specific means of grace, whereby men are ingrafted into Christ. The word, as

---

* Question 20. *Are all men then saved by Christ, as they have perished by Adam?* No; only such as, by true faith, are ingrafted into Him, and receive all His benefits.

preached to the unbaptized by the Apostles, was a call *to* Christ. This was its object, to turn the attention of men to Him as the true Messiah, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. When they were ready to receive Him, they were baptized into Him, and thus made members of Him. In the Church, the word is continually used to instruct those who are baptized, according to the great commission, and thus train them up in the knowledge of the glorious grace signed and sealed to them in their baptism. The word is always to them *in the Lord.*

Christian Baptism, then, we think the Scriptures teach, is the sacrament of our incorporation into Christ. In this sacrament, as in the Lord's supper also, we are confronted with Christianity, as an objective reality. The powers of the heavenly world are in them brought nigh to the inhabitants of earth. This is the sacrament which confronts those who would enter into the kingdom of divine grace. Though visible only as water, it has enshrined in it the invisible grace which must cleanse us, when we enter the congregation of the people of the Lord. It is important that we should believe in its sacred mystery. Strip it of its meaning, as is done in much of the unsacramental, and anti-sacramental religion of the day, and it becomes a mere empty form, an idle ceremony, and passes out of use as a superstition of the past. Believe in its true character, and it stands again for us centrally in the great commission. It is important, especially in our day, that the objective, sacramental, in Christianity, should be made to confront us. In proportion as we realize its presence and power, will vigor be imparted also to our subjective experience. It will be no longer a sentimental dream or fancy, a human exercise, but the activities of the supernatural world within us. If we have faith in our being thus *in Christ*, we will be prepared to see some meaning in Christ *in us*, as the light and life of all our Christian experience.

II. "I IN YOU." It will be seen from what has already been said, that there is another side of our religion, the subjective or experimental. It is not enough, that we should be in Christ;

it is required that Christ should also be formed in us the hope of glory. The ingrafting only puts the branch in a position to grow; it only forms a new relation; it only originates a basis or starting point. How great and wonderful the work that follows! This organic relation now becomes positive and active. The branch is no longer a passive thing. When the life of the vine pushes itself into the branch, the branch also begins to act, to perform important functions. If, now, all the wonderful process could be laid open, if we could show how a tree grows, how the sap passes up and out into the branches, into the leaves, and is there acted upon by the very air, which those leaves continually breathe, how it undergoes a wonderful process, and then returns and forms woody fibre, and is made a part of the solid bulk of the tree;—if we could see the wonderful play and interweaving of organic forces, their mutual action and re-action, we might have before us a visible picture of the Christian's growth in the divine life. It is our Saviour's analogy.

Or if we take the other analogy, that of our natural birth and growth in sin, we might see the same thing. The natural birth of a child is but the beginning of a life of sin. For a time the development is an unconscious one. The child does not yet know what is going on in its inner, hidden life. It is not yet capable of actual sin, yet it is sinful. But when that sinful nature develops itself in thinking and willing, then appears the bitter fruit. No longer is it Adam's sin, or original sin; every act of transgression makes the sin, in a new sense, its own. There are action and re-action. The old sinful nature acts upon the will, and the will in turn acts upon the sinful nature, and thus the process goes on. At first the child is only in Adam, ingrafted in our fallen Adamic nature; afterwards Adam is in the child, that is, the sinful nature develops and becomes self-consciously its own.

In the same way, the relation formed with Christ for the child in baptism is the beginning of a process, in which the fallen nature, by the entrance into it of a new life, is taken up, rescued from the dominion of sin, and assimilated to redeemed

human nature in Christ. This process already begins in the infantile spirit of the child. How, we may not be able to explain. But the Holy Spirit, which hovered over the original chaos of matter, is surely not present in vain in the chaos of a fallen spirit, now brought into union with Christ. There is activity, development in the spirit of a child. Evil is there in unconscious processes of growth. Is it unnatural, or unintelligible to suppose, that the Holy Spirit can be active there in biassing the child toward the good, in preparing the way, in opposition to the powers of evil, for its future enlightenment, and willing surrender to the powers of grace?

But as we follow the development of the child, as it arrives at years of knowledge, our analogies fail us. The branch grows by a law which governs it, of which it, of course, has no knowledge. The child, under the law of sin and death, has no power to deliver himself from it. In the case of the baptised, even when trained under the best influences outwardly, there comes a time when the grace of Christ must be appropriated by its own will. The life of Christ does not mould the spirit blindly, nor yet in such a way as to destroy man's power of free will. Hence there must be a positive acceptance of the grace given. In other words the life of Christ reaches to the human will itl self, and seeks to bring it into subjection to His will. Here there is a crisis in the development of the religious life. Often it is accompanied with no serious struggles, no abrupt experiences. The will accepts, the heart is surrendered, gently, gradually, as the rosy aurora blends imperceptibly into the full-light of day. In some cases, especially where there has been a departure from the path of virtue, the crisis is attended with internal excitement. The power of evil, allowed for a time to assert its power, is to be driven out. Christ is to assume His supremacy, and the evil goes out not without grumbling dissatisfaction. Then, if the individual so will, he may reject the grace of Christ, and become a dead branch, fit only to be cut off and cast into the fire. This crisis is often regarded as the period of the new birth, of conversion, or regeneration, as these terms are often interchangeably, but improperly, used. By

giving their attention continually to this stage in the religious growth, some whole denominations have become so entirely absorbed in it, that they have come to overlook entirely the sacramental beginning of the Christian life, and that period of Christian nurture which succeeds it. How much confusion would be avoided, in disputes on regeneration, conversion, &c., if the true significance of Christian baptism were always kept in view! And how much would it make for the earnest, thorough, prayerful, religious instruction of the young!

In the development of the Christian life now, the end of it all is that Christ may be more and more *in* him, so that what was comprehended potentially, or germinally, in his baptism, may become actual in his life. The death of Christ repeats itself, so to speak, in His members, where there is a death unto sin, a real crucifixion to the world, yea, a sharing with Christ in His offering of Himself to God. The offering of himself, in connection with the symbolical oblation in the Eucharist, is not a mere conception, but an act. The New Testament is full of this idea of fellowship in the sufferings of Christ.* "That I may know the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death." "Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake, which is the Church." "But rejoice, in as much as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when His glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy."

So, also, the resurrection of Christ is a fact, which realizes its power more and more in their life, first, as a resurrection from the death of sin, and then, as it looks forward continually to its full fruit in their own resurrection at last from the dead. Hence their feeding upon His body and blood in the Eucharist is not a mere figure of speech, but a most solemn reality; for Christ is literally and truly their meat and drink, by which they are nourished unto everlasting life. They realize in their lives

---

* Phil. iii. 10. Col. i. 24. 1 Pet. iv. 13. See also, Rom. vi. 6. Gal. ii. 20, and v. 24 and vi. 11.

more and more the image of Christ in all its loveliness and glory. The mind that was in Christ is also in them. So real is this presence of Christ *in* them, that Paul declares, "I live; yet not I, Christ liveth in me."

Here we have Christian experience, as the life of Christ is more and more apprehended in the human consciousness. Repentance, faith, hope, love, prayer, and praise, all these are the blooming fruits in the history of his life. His active obedience to the law, and his acts of benevolence, are only the realization of the life of Christ in his life. As every tree produces after its kind, as the image of the first Adam is reproduced in all his descendants, so Christians are Christ-bearers, epistles, known and read of all men. The Church becomes the reflection of the image of Him, who is altogether lovely, the chief among ten thousand.

Yet, when we have learned all that we can know from the analogies of nature, there remains the great and glorious mystery of God's union with man, and man's union with God, which is above all finite comprehension. The mystery of the hypostatical union of the divine and the human in the person of Christ, the deepest of all mysteries, lies back of it. In the light of that mystery we study it; but we can know only in part here, for here we see through a glass darkly, but there face to face.

If we are asked, then, why we emphasize the sacramental in Christianity, our answer is, because it comports with the objective realities of the kingdom of grace, as these flow from Christ, and become continually the fountain of that perennial flow of Christian experience, which makes glad the hearts of God's people. It presents to us the mysteries of the kingdom of grace, and challenges our faith in them. It is clearly and forcibly brought before us in the divine record. The Scriptures teach that Christianity is sacramental. Shall we, then, be frightened from the sacraments in their true character by the empty and meaningless cry of Romanizing tendencies? There is a gulf in rationalism which, to say the least, is as horrible as that of Popery. That theory of Christianity, which makes it to consist in abstract truth, an order of teaching for the intellect, which

plumes itself on its title to being rational, which instinctively shrinks from the very idea of mysteries, is already on the verge of this gulf. We choose not to be drawn with it into the awful maelstroom. The hoary truths and verities of our holy religion are dearer to us than the insinuating favor of popular applause. Let us stand firm on these tried foundations amid the rocking waves of rationalism and infidelity. Truth must triumph over error, and be crowned at last with glorious victory.

ART. V.—THE GENIUS AND THEOLOGY OF ST. AUGUSTINE.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., NEW YORK.

AUGUSTINE, the man with upturned eye, with pen in the left hand, and a burning heart in the right (as he is usually represented), is, by universal agreement, one of the master minds in the history of Christianity, who have made a profound and lasting impression upon his age and all subsequent generations. He was a philosophical and theological genius of the first order, towering, like a pyramid, above his age, and looking down commandingly upon succeeding centuries. He had a mind uncommonly fertile and deep, bold and soaring; and with it, what is better, a heart full of Christian love and humility. He stands, of right, by the side of the greatest philosophers of antiquity and of modern times. We meet him alike on the broad highways and the narrow footpaths, on the giddy Alpine heights, and in the awful depths of speculation, wherever philosophical thinkers before him or after him have trod. As a theologian, he is *facile princeps*, at least surpassed by no church father, scholastic, or reformer. With royal munificence he scattered ideas in passing, which have set in mighty motion other lands and later times. He combined the creative power of Tertullian with the churchly spirit of Cyprian, the speculative intellect of the Greek Church with the practical tact of the Latin. He was a Christian philosopher and a philosophical theologian to the

full. It was his need and his delight to wrestle again and again with the hardest problems of thought, and to comprehend, to the utmost, the divinely revealed matter of the faith. He always asserted, indeed, the primacy of faith, according to his maxim: *Fides præcedit intellectum;* appealing, with theologians before him, to the well-known passage of Isaiah vii. 9 (in the LXX.): "Nisi credideritis, non intelligetis." But to him faith itself was an acting of reason, and from faith to knowledge, therefore, there was a necessary transition. He constantly looked below the surface to the hidden motives of actions and to the universal laws of diverse events. The metaphysician and the Christian believer coalesced in him. His *meditatio* passes with the utmost ease into *oratio*, and his *oratio* into *meditatio*. With profundity he combined an equal clearness and sharpness of thought. He was an extremely skilful and a successful dialectician, inexhaustible in arguments and in answers to the objections of his adversaries.

He has enriched Latin literature with a greater store of beautiful, original, and pregnant proverbial sayings, than any classic author, or any other teacher of the Church. We remind the reader of a few of the most striking:

"Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet, Vetus in Novo patet."
"Distingue tempora, et concordabit Scriptura."
"Cor nostrum inquietum est, donec requiescat in Te."
"Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis."
"Non vincit nisi veritas, victoria veritatis est caritas."
"Ubi amor, ibi trinitas."
"Fides præcedit intellectum."
"Deo servire vera libertas est."
"Nulla infelicitas frangit, quem felicitas nulla corrumpit."

The famous maxim of ecclesiastical harmony: "In necessariis unitas, in dubiis (or non necessariis) libertas, in omnibus (in utrisque) caritas,"—which is often ascribed to Augustine, dates in this form not from him, but from a much later period. Luecke (in a special treatise on the antiquity of the author, the original form, etc., of this sentence, Göttingen, 1850) traces

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARIES

the authorship to RUPERT MELDENIUS, an irenical German theologian of the seventeenth century.

Augustine had a creative and decisive hand in almost every dogma of the Church, completing some, and advancing others. The centre of his system is the FREE REDEEMING GRACE OF GOD IN CHRIST, OPERATING THROUGH THE ACTUAL, HISTORICAL CHURCH. He is evangelical or Pauline in his doctrine of sin and grace, but catholic (that is, old-catholic, not Roman Catholic), in his doctrine of the Church. The Pauline element comes forward mainly in the Pelagian controversy, the catholic churchly in the Donatist; but each is modified by the other.

Dr. BAUR incorrectly makes *freedom* the fundamental idea of the Augustinian system (it much better suits the Pelagian), and founds on this view an ingenious, but only half true, comparison between Augustine and Origen. "There is no Church teacher of the ancient period," says he, "who, in intellect and in grandeur and consistency of view, can more justly be placed by the side of Origen than Augustine; none who, with all the difference in individuality and in mode of thought, so closely resembles him. How far both towered above their times, is most clearly manifest in the very fact that they alone of all the theologians of the first six centuries, became the creators of distinct systems, each proceeding from its definite idea, and each completely carried out; and this fact proves also how much the one system has that is analogous to the other. The one system, like the other, is founded upon the idea of *freedom;* in both there is a specific act, by which the entire development of human life is determined; and in both, this is an act which lies far outside of the temporal consciousness of the individual; with this difference alone, that in one system the act belongs to each separate individual himself, and only falls outside of his temporal life and consciousness; in the other, it lies within the sphere of the temporal history of man, but is only the act of one individual. If, in the system of Origen, nothing gives greater offence than the idea of the pre-existence and fall of souls, which seems to adopt heathen ideas into the Christian faith, there is in the system of Augustine the same overleaping

of individual life and consciousness, in order to explain from an act in the past, the present sinful condition of man; but the pagan Platonic point of view is exchanged for one taken from the Old Testament. . . . What, therefore, essentially distinguishes the system of Augustine from that of Origen, is only this: the fall of Adam is substituted for the pre-temporal fall of souls, and what in Origin still wears a heathen garb, puts on in Augustine a purely Old Testament form."

The learning of Augustine was not equal to his genius, nor as extensive as that of Origen and Eusebius, but still considerable for his time, and superior to that of any of the Latin fathers, with the single exception of Jerome. He had received, in the schools of Madaura and Carthage, a good theoretical and rhetorical preparation for the forum, which stood him in good stead also in theology. He was familiar with Latin literature, and was by no means blind to the excellencies of the classics, though he placed them far below the higher beauty of the Holy Scriptures. The Hortensius of Cicero (a lost work) inspired him, during his university course, with enthusiasm for philosophy and for the knowledge of truth for its own sake; the study of Platonic and Neo-Platonic works (in the Latin version of the rhetorician Victorinus), kindled in him an incredible fire; though, in both, he missed the holy name of Jesus and the cardinal virtues of love and humility, and found in them only beautiful ideals, without power to conform him to them. With the Greek language and literature he had, in comparison with Jerome, but a superficial acquaintance. Hebrew he did not understand at all. Hence, with all his extraordinary familiarity with the Latin Bible, he made many mistakes in exposition. He was rather a thinker than a scholar, and depended mainly on his own resources, which were always abundant.

The numerous *writings* of Augustine, the composition of which extended through four and forty years, are a mine of Christian knowledge and experience. They abound in lofty ideas, noble sentiments, devout effusions, clear statements of truth, strong arguments against error, and passages of fervid eloquence and undying beauty; but also in innumerable repe-

titions, fanciful opinions and playful conjectures of his uncommonly fertile brain. His style is full of life and force, but not free from wearisome prolixity and from that *vagabunda loquacitas*, with which his adroit opponent, Julian of Eclanum, charged him. He would rather, as he said, be blamed by grammarians, than not understood by the people; and he bestowed little care upon his style, though he many a time rises in lofty poetic flight. He made no point of literary renown, but, impelled by love to God and to the Church, he wrote from the fulness of his mind and heart. The writings, before his conversion, a treatise on the Beautiful (De Pulchro et Opto), the orations and eulogies which he delivered, as rhetorician, at Carthage, Rome, and Milan, are lost. The professor of eloquence, the heathen philosopher, the Manichæan heretic, the sceptic and free-thinker, are known to us only from his regrets and recantations in the Confessions and other works. His literary career for us commences in his pious retreat, at Cassiciacum, where he prepared himself for a public profession of his faith. He appears first, in the works composed at Cassiciacum, Rome, and near Tagaste, as a Christian philosopher, after his consecration to the priesthood, as a theologian. Yet, even in his theological works, he everywhere manifests the metaphysical and speculative bent of his mind. He never abandoned or depreciated reason; he only subordinated it to faith, and made it subservient to the defence of revealed truth. Faith is the pioneer of reason, and discovers the territory which reason explores.

The following is a classified view of his most important works:

I. AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL works. To these belong the Confessions and the Retractations; the former acknowledging his sins, the latter his theoretical errors. In the one he subjects his life, in the other his writings, to close criticism; and these productions, therefore, furnish the best standard for judging of his entire labors.

The Confessions are the most profitable, at least the most edifying, product of his pen; indeed, we may no doubt say, the

most edifying book in all the patristic literature. They were, accordingly, the most read even during his life-time, and they have been the most frequently published since. A more sincere and more earnest book was never written. The historical part, to the tenth book, is one of the devotional classics of all creeds, and second in popularity only to the "Imitation of Christ," by Thomas a Kempis, and Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress." Certainly, no autobiography is superior to it in true humility, spiritual depth, and universal interest. Augustine's experience as a heathen sensualist, a Manichæan heretic, an anxious enquirer, a sincere penitent, and a grateful convert, is reflected in every human soul that struggles through the temptations of nature and the labyrinth of error, to the knowledge of truth and the beauty of holiness, and after many sighs and tears, finds rest and peace in the arms of a merciful Saviour. Rousseau's "Confessions" and Goethe's "Truth and Fiction," though written in a radically different spirit, may be compared with Augustine's Confessions, as works of rare genius and of absorbing interest; but by attempting to exalt human nature, in its unsanctified state, they tend as much to expose its vanity and weakness, as the work of the bishop of Hippo, being written with a single eye to the glory of God, raises man from the dust of repentance to a new and imperishable life of the Spirit.

Augustine composed the Confessions about the year 400. The first ten books contain, in the form of a continuous prayer and confession before God, a general sketch of his earlier life, of his conversion, and of his return to Africa in the thirty-fourth year of his age. The salient points in these books are the engaging history of his conversion in Milan, and the story of the last days of his noble mother in Ostia; she, as it were, at the very gate of heaven, and in full assurance of a blessed reunion at the throne of glory. The last three books (and a part of the tenth) are devoted to speculative philosophy; they treat, partly in tacit opposition to Manichæism, of the metaphysical questions of the possibility of knowing God, and the nature of time and space; and they give an interpretation of the Mosaic cosmogony in the style of the typical allegorical exegesis usual

with the fathers, but foreign to our age; they are, therefore, of little value to the general reader, except as showing that even abstract metaphysical subjects may be devotionally treated.

The Retractations were produced in the evening of his life (427), when, mindful of the proverb: "In the multitude of words there wanteth not sin," and remembering that we must give account for every idle word, he judged himself, that he might not be judged. He revised, in chronological order, the numerous works he had written before and during his episcopate, and retracted or corrected whatever in them seemed to his riper knowledge false or obscure. In all essential points, nevertheless, his theological system remained the same from his conversion to this time. The Retractions give beautiful evidence of his love of truth, his conscientiousness, and his humility.

To this same class should be added the Letters of Augustine, of which the Benedictine editors, in their second volume, give two hundred and seventy (including letters *to* Augustine) in chronological order from A. D. 386 to A. D. 429. These letters treat, sometimes very minutely, of all the important questions of his time, and give us an insight of his cares, his official fidelity, his large heart, and his effort to become, like Paul, all things to all men.

When the questions of friends and pupils accumulated, he answered them in special works; and in this way he produced various collections of Quæstiones and Responsiones, dogmatical, exegetical, and miscellaneous (A. D. 390, 397, &c).

II. PHILOSOPHICAL treatises, in dialogue; almost all composed in his earlier life; either during his residence at the country-seat Cassiciacum, in the vicinity of Milan, where he spent half a year before his baptism in instructive and stimulating conversation, in a sort of academy, with Monica, his son, and Adeodatus, his brother Navigius, his friend Alypius, and some cousins and pupils; or during his second residence in Rome, or soon after his return to Africa.

To this class belong the works: Contra Academicos libri tres (386), in which he combats the skepticism and probabilism of the New Academy,—the doctrine that man can never reach the

truth, but can at best attain only probability; De vita beata (386), in which he makes true blessedness to consist in the perfect knowledge of God; De ordine,—on the relation of evil to the divine order of the world (386); Soliloquia (387), communings with his own soul concerning God, the highest good, the knowledge of truth, and immortality; De immortalitate animæ (387), a continuation of the Soliloquies; De quantitate animæ (387), discussing sundry questions of the size, the origin, the incorporeity of the soul; De musica libri vi (387–389); De magistro (389), in which, in a dialogue with his son Adeodatus, a pious and promising, but precocious youth, who died soon after his return to Africa (389), he treats on the importance and virtue of the word of God, and on Christ, as the infallible Master. To these may be added the later work, De anima et ejus origine (419). Other philosophical works on grammar, dialectics (or *ars bene disputandi*), rhetoric, geometry, and arithmetic, are lost.

These works exhibit as yet little that is specially Christian and churchly; but they show a Platonism seized and consecrated by the spirit of Christianity, full of high thoughts, ideal views, and discriminating argument. They were designed to present the different stages of human thought, by which he himself had reached the knowledge of the truth, and to serve others as steps to the sanctuary. They form an elementary introduction to his theology. He afterwards, in his Retractions, withdrew many things contained in them, like the Platonic view of the pre-existence of the soul, and the Platonic idea that the acquisition of knowledge is a recollection or excavation of the knowledge hidden in the mind. The philosopher in him afterwards yielded more and more to the theologian, and his views became more positive and empirical, though in some cases narrower also and more confined. Yet he could never cease to philosophize, and even his later works, especially De Trinitate and De Civitate Dei, are full of profound speculations. Before his conversion he followed a particular system of philosophy, first the Manichæan, then the Platonic; after his conversion he embraced the christian philosophy which is based on the Divine

revelation of the Scriptures, and is the hand-maid of theology and religion; but at the same time he prepared the way for the Catholic ecclesiastical philosophy which rests on the authority of the church, and became complete in the scholasticism of the middle age.

In the history of philosophy he deserves a place in the highest rank, and has done greater service to the science of sciences than any other father, Clement of Alexandria and Origen not excepted. He attacked and refuted the pagan philosophy as pantheistic or dualistic at heart; he shook the superstitions of astrology and magic; he expelled from philosophy the doctrine of emanation, and the idea that God is the soul of the world; he substantially advanced psychology; he solved the question of the origin and the nature of evil more nearly than any of his predecessors, and as nearly as most of his successors; he was the first to investigate thoroughly the relation of divine omnipotence and omniscience to human freedom, and to construct a theodicy; in short, he is properly the founder of a Christian philosophy, and not only divided with Aristotle the empire of the mediæval scholasticism, but furnished also living germs for new systems of philosophy, and will always be consulted in the speculative establishment of Christian doctrines.

III. APOLOGETIC works against Pagans and Jews. Among these the twenty-two books, De Civitate Dei, are still well worth reading. They form the deepest and richest apologetic work of antiquity; begun in 413 after the occupation of Rome by the Gothic king Alaric, finished in 426, and often separately published. They condense his entire theory of the world and of man, and are the first attempt at a comprehensive philosophy of universal history under the dualistic view of two antagonistic currents or organized forces, a kingdom of this world is doomed to final destruction, and a kingdom of God which will last forever.

IV. RELIGIOUS-THEOLOGICAL works of a general nature (in part anti-Manichæan): De utilitate credendi, against the

Gnostic exaltation of knowledge (392); De fide et symbolo, a discourse which, though only presbyter, he delivered on the Apostles' Creed before the council at Hippo at the request of the bishops in 393; De doctrina Christiana iv libri (297; the fourth book added in 426), a compend of exegetical theology for instruction in the interpretation of the Scriptures according to the analogy of the faith; De catechizandis rudibus, likewise for catechetical purposes (400); Enchiridion, or De fide, spe et caritate, a brief compend of the doctrine of faith and morals, which he wrote in 421, or later, at the request of Laurentius; hence also called Manuale ad Laurentium.

V. Polemic-Theological works. These are the most copious sources of the history of doctrine. The heresies collectively are reviewed in the book De hæresibus ad Quodvultdeum, written between 428 and 430 to a friend and deacon in Carthage, and giving a survey of eighty-eight heresies, from the Simonians to the Pelagians. In the work De vera religione (390) Augustine proposed to show that the true religion is to be found not with the heretics and schismatics, but only in the catholic church of that time.

The other controversial works are directed against the particular heresies of Manichæism, Donatism, Arianism, Pelagianism, and Semi-Pelagianism. Augustine, with all the firmness of his convictions, was free from personal antipathy, and used the pen of controversy in the genuine Christian spirit, *fortiter in re, suaviter in modo.* He understood Paul's *ἀληθεύειν ἐν ἀγάπῃ*, and forms in this respect a pleasing contrast to Jerome, who probably had by nature no more fiery temperament, than he, but was less able to control it. "Let those," he very beautifully says to the Manichæans, "burn with hatred against you, who do not know how much pains it costs to find the truth, how hard it is to guard against error;—but I who after so great and long wavering came to know the truth, must bear myself towards you with the same patience which my fellow-believers showed towards me while I was wandering in blind madness in your opinions."

1. The ANTI-MANICHÆAN works date mostly from his earlier life, and in time and matter follow immediately upon his philosophical writings. In them he afterwards found most to retract, because he advocated the freedom of the will against the Manichæan fatalism. The most important are: De moribus ecclesiæ catholicæ, et de moribus Manichæorum, two books (written during hie second residence in Rome, 388): De vera religione (390); Unde malum, et de libero arbitrio, usually simply Do libero arbitrio, in three books, against the Manichæan doctrine of evil as a substance, and as having its seat in matter instead of free will (begun in 388, finished in 395); De Genesi contra Manichæos, a defence of the biblical doctrine of creation (389); De duabus animabus.

These works treat of the origin of evil; of free will; of the harmony of the Old and New Testaments, and of revelation and nature; of creation out of nothing, in opposition to dualism and hylozoism; of the supremacy of faith over knowledge; of the authority of the Scriptures and the Church; of the true and the false ascetitism, and other disputed points; and they are the chief source of our knowledge of the Manichæan Gnosticism, and of the arguments against it. Having himself belonged for nine years to this sect, Augustine was the better fitted for the task of refuting it, as Paul was peculiarly prepared for the confutation of the Pharisee Judaism. His doctrine of the nature of evil is particularly valuable. He has triumphantly demonstrated for all time, that evil is not a corporeal thing, nor in any way substantial, but a product of the free will of the creature, a perversion of substance in itself good, a corruption of the nature created by God.

2. Against the PRISCILLIANISTS, a sect in Spain built on Manichæan principles, are directed the book Ad Paulum Orosium contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas (411); the book Contra mendacium, addressed to Consentius (420); and in part the 190th Epistle (alias Ep. 157), to the bishop Optatus, on the origin of the soul (418), and two other letters, in which he refutes erroneous views on the nature of the soul, the limitation of

future punishments, and the lawfulness of fraud for supposed good purposes.

3. The ANTI-DONATISTIC works, composed between the years 393 and 420, argue against separatism, and contain Augustine's doctrine of the church and church-discipline, and of the sacraments. To these belong: Psalmus contra partem Donati (A. D. 393), a polemic popular song without regular metre, intended to offset the songs of the Donatists; Contra epistolam Parmeniani, written in 400 against the Carthaginian bishop of the Donatists, the successor of Donatus; De baptismo contra Donatistas, in favor of the validity of heretical baptism (400); Contra literas Petiliani (about 400), against the view of Cyprian and the Donatists, that the efficacy of the sacraments depends on the personal worthiness and the ecclesiastical status of the officiating priest; Ad Catholicos Epistola contra Donatistas, vulgo De unitate ecclesiæ (402); Contra Cresconium grammaticum Donatistam (406); Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis, a short account of the three-days' religious conference with the Donatists (411); De correctione Donatistarum (417); Contra Gaudentium, Donat. Episcopum, the last anti-Donatistic work (420).

4. The ANTI-ARIAN works have to do with the deity of Christ and of the Holy Ghost, and with the Holy Trinity. By far the most important of these are the fifteen books De trinitate (400–416);—the most profound and discriminating production of the ancient church on the Trinity, in no respect inferior to the kindred works of Athanasius and the two Gregories, and for centuries final to the dogma. This may also be counted among the positive didactic works, for it is not directly controversial. The Collatio cum Maximino Ariano, an obscure babbler, belongs to the year 428.

5. The numerous ANTI-PELAGIAN works of Augustine are his most influential and most valuable. They were written between the years 412 and 429. In them Augustine, in his intellectual and spiritual prime, develops his system of anthropology and soteriology, and most nearly approaches the position of evangelical Protestantism: On the Guilt and the Remission of Sins,

and Infant Baptism (412); On the Spirit and the Letter (413); On Nature and Grace (415); On the Acts of Pelagius (417); On the Grace of Christ, and Original Sin (418); On Marriage and Concupiscence (419); On Grace and Free Will (426); On Discipline and Grace (427); Against Julian of Eclanum (two large works, written between 421 and 429, the second unfinished, and hence called Opus imperfectum); On the Predestination of the Saints (428); On the Gift of Perseverance (429); &c.

VI. EXEGETICAL works. The best of these are: De Genesi ad literam (The Genesis word for word), in twelve books, an extended exposition of the first three chapters of Genesis, particularly the history of the Creation literally interpreted, though with many mystical and allegorical interpretations also (written between 401 and 415); Enarrationes in Psalmos (mostly sermons); the hundred and twenty-four Homilies on the Gospel of John (416 and 417); the ten Homilies on the First Epistle of John (417); the Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount (393); the Harmony of the Gospels (De consensu evangelistarum, 400); the Epistle to the Galatians (394); and the unfinished commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.

Augustine deals more in lively, profound, and edifying thoughts on the Scriptures than in proper grammatical and historical exposition, for which neither he nor his readers had the necessary linguistic knowledge, disposition, or taste. He grounded his theology less upon exegesis than upon his Christian and churchly mind, saturated with Scriptural truths.

VII. ETHICAL or PRACTICAL and ASCETIC works. Among these belong three hundred and ninety-six Sermones (mostly very short) de Scripturis (on texts of Scripture), de tempore (festival sermons), de sanctis (in memory of apostles, martyrs, and saints), and de diversis (on various occasions), some of them dictated by Augustine, some taken down by hearers. Also various moral treatises: De continentia (395); De mendacio (395), against deception (not to be confounded with the similar work already mentioned, Contra mendacium, against the fraud-

theory of the Priscillianists, written in 420); De agone Christiano (396); De opere monachorum, against monastic idleness (400); De bono conjugali adv. Jovinianum (400); De virginitate (401); De fide et operibus (413); De adulterinis conjugiis, on 1 Cor. vii. 10 sqq. (419); De bono viduitatis (418); De patientia (418); De cura pro mortuis gerenda, to Paulinus of Nola (421); De utilitate jejunii; De diligendo Deo; Meditationes; etc.

As we survey this enormous literary labor, augmented by many other treatises and letters now lost, and as we consider his episcopal labors, his many journeys, and his adjudications of controversies among the faithful, which often robbed him of whole days, we must be really astounded at the fidelity, exuberance, energy, and perseverance of this father of the Church. Surely, such a life was worth the living.

The *influence* of Augustine and his theology upon posterity is almost beyond calculation, and far surpasses that of any other father, Greek or Latin. It extends alike over Catholicism and Protestantism, the middle ages and modern times. Upon the Greek church alone has he exercised little or no influence; for this church stopped with the undeveloped synergistic anthropology of the previous age. "Augustine," says Dr. Huber, (in his instructive work: Die Philosophie der Kirchenväter, Munich, 1859, p. 312 sq.), "is a unique phenomenon in Christian history. No one of the other fathers has left so luminous traces of his existence. Though we find among them many rich and powerful minds, yet we find in none the forces of personal character, mind, heart, and will so largely developed and so harmoniously working. No one surpasses him in wealth of perception and dialectical sharpness of thoughts, in depth and fervor of religious sensibility, in greatness of aims and energy of action. He therefore also marks the culmination of the patristic age, and has been elevated by the acknowledgment of succeeding times as the first and the universal church father.—His whole character reminds us in many respects of Paul, with whom he has also in common the experience of being called from manifold

errors to the service of the gospel, and like whom he could boast that he had labored in it more abundantly than all the others. And as Paul among the Apostles pre-eminently determined the development of Christianity, and became, more than all others, the expression of the Christian mind, to which men ever afterwards return, as often as in the life of the Church that mind becomes turbid, to draw from him, as the purest fountain, a fresh understanding of the Bible doctrine,—so has Augustine turned the Christian nations since his time for the most part into his paths, and become pre-eminently their trainer and teacher, in the study of whom they always gain a renewal and deepening of their Christian consciousness. Not the middle age alone, but the Reformation also was ruled by him; and whatever to this day boasts of the Christian spirit, is connected at least in part with Augustine."

It betrays a very contracted, slavish, and mechanical view of history, when Roman Catholic divines claim the fathers as their exclusive property, forgetting that they taught a great many things which are as inconsistent with the papal as with the Protestant Creed. "I recollect well," says Dr. Newman, the former intellectual leader of Oxford Tractarianism (in his Letter to Dr. Pusey on his Eirenicon, 1866, p. 5), "what an outcast I seemed to myself, when I took down from the shelves of my library the volumes of St. Athanasius or St. Basil, and set myself to study them; and how, on the contrary, when at length I was brought into Catholic communion, I kissed them with delight, with a feeling that in them I had more than all that I had lost, and, as though I were directly addressing the glorious saints, who bequeathed them to the Church, I said to the inanimate pages, 'You are now mine, and I am yours, beyond any mistake.'" With the same right the Jews might lay exclusive claim to the writings of Moses and the prophets. The fathers were living men, representing the onward progress and conflicts of Christianity at their time, unfolding and defending great truths, but not unmixed with many errors and imperfections which subsequent times have corrected. Those are the true children of the fathers who, standing on the foundation of Christ and the apos-

tles, and kissing the New Testament rather than any human writings, follow them only as far as they followed Christ, and who carry forward their work in the onward march of true catholic Christianity.

1. Augustine, in the first place, contributed much to the development of the doctrinal basis which Catholicism and Protestantism hold *in common* against such radical heresies of antiquity as Manichæism, Arianism, and Pelagianism. In all these great intellectual conflicts he was in general the champion of the cause of Christian truth against dangerous errors. Through his influence the canon of Holy Scripture (including, indeed, the Old Testament Apocrypha) was fixed in its present form by the councils of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397). He conquered the Manichæan dualism, hylozoism, and fatalism, and saved the bibical idea of God and of creation, and the biblical doctrine of the nature of sin and its origin in the free will of man. He developed the Nicene dogma of the Trinity, completed it by the doctrine of the double procession of the Holy Ghost, and gave it the form in which it has ever since prevailed in the West, and in which it received classical expression from his school in the Athanasian Creed. In Christology, on the contrary, he added nothing, and he died shortly before the great Christological conflicts opened, which reached their ecumenical settlement at the council of Chalcedon, twenty years after his death. Yet he anticipated Leo in giving currency in the West to the important formula: "Two natures in one person."

2. Augustine is also substantially the theological creator of the *Latin-Catholic* system as distinct from the Greek Catholicism on the one hand, and from evangelical Protestantism on the other. He ruled the entire theology of the middle age, and became the father of scholasticism in virtue of his dialectic mind, and the father of mysticism by his glowing heart, without being responsible for the excesses of either system. For scholasticism thought to comprehend the divine with the understanding, and lost itself at last in empty dialectics; and mysticism endeavored to grasp the divine with feeling, and easily strayed into misty sentimentalism; Augustine sought to apprehend the divine with the united power of mind and heart, of bold

thought and humble faith. Anselm, Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas Aquinas, and Bonaventura are his nearest of kin in this respect. Even now, since the Catholic Church has become a Roman church, he enjoys greater consideration in it than Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome, or Gregory the Great. All this cannot possibly be explained without an interior affinity.

His very conversion, in which, besides the Scriptures, the personal intercourse of the hierarchical Ambrose and the life of the ascetic Anthony had great influence, was a transition not from heathenism to Christianity (for he was already a Manichæan Christian), but from heresy to the historical, episcopally organized church, as, for the time, the sole authorized vehicle of the apostolic Christianity in conflict with those sects and parties which more or less assailed the foundations of the gospel. It was, indeed, a full and unconditional surrender of his mind and heart to God, but it was at the same time a submission of his private judgment to the authority of the church which led him to the faith of the gospel. In the same spirit he embraced the ascetic life, without which, according to the catholic principle, no high religion is possible. He did not, indeed, enter a cloister, like Luther, whose conversion in Erfurt was likewise essentially catholic, but he lived in his house in the simplicity of a monk, and made and kept the vow of voluntary poverty and celibacy.

He adopted Cyprian's doctrine of the Church, and completed it in the conflict with Donatism by transferring the predicates of unity, holiness, universality, exclusiveness, and maternity directly to the actual church of the time, which, with a firm episcopal organization, an unbroken succession, and the Apostles' Creed, triumphantly withstood the eighty or the hundred opposing sects in the heretical catalogue of the day, and had its visible centre in Rome. In this church he had found rescue from the shipwreck of his life, the home of true Christianity, firm ground for his thinking, satisfaction for his heart, and a commensurate field for the wide range of his powers. The predicate of infallibility alone he does not plainly bring forward; he assumes a progressive correction of earlier counsels by later;

and in the Pelagian controversy he asserts the same independence towards pope Zosimus, which Cyprian before him had shown towards pope Stephen in the controversy on heretical baptism, with the advantage of having the right on his side, so that Zosimus found himself compelled to yield to the African Church.

He was the first to give a clear and fixed definition of the sacrament, as a visible sign of invisible grace, resting on divine appointment; but he knows nothing of the number seven; this was a much later enactment. In the doctrine of baptism he is entirely catholic, though in logical contradiction with his dogma of predestination; but in the doctrine of the holy communion he stands, like his predecessors, Tertullian and Cyprian, nearer to the Calvinistic theory. He also contributed to promote, at least in his later writings, the catholic faith of miracles and the worship of Mary; though he exempts the Virgin only from actual sin, not from original, and, with all his reverence for her, never calls her mother of God.

At first an advocate of religious liberty and of purely spiritual methods of opposing error, he afterwards asserted the fatal principle of the *coge intrare*, and lent the great weight of his authority to the system of civil persecution, at the bloody fruits of which, in the middle age, he himself would have shuddered; for he was always at heart a man of love and gentleness, and personally acted on the glorious principle: "Nothing conquers but truth, and the victory of truth is love."

Thus even truly great and good men have unintentionally, through mistaken zeal, become the authors of much mischief.

3. But, on the other hand, Augustine is, of all the fathers, nearest to *evangelical Protestantism*, and may be called, in respect of his doctrine of sin and grace, the first forerunner of the Reformation. The Lutheran and Reformed Churches have ever conceded to him, without scruple, the cognomen of Saint, and claimed him among the most enlightened witnesses of the truth and most striking examples of the marvellous power of divine grace in the transformation of a sinner. It is worthy of mark, that his Pauline doctrines, which are most nearly akin to Pro-

testantism, are the later and more mature parts of his system, and that just these found great acceptance with the laity. The Pelagian controversy, in which he developed his anthropology, marks the culmination of his theological and ecclesiastical career, and his latest writings were directed against the Pelagian Julian and the semi-Pelagians in Gaul, who were brought to his notice by the two friendly laymen, Prosper and Hilary. These anti-Pelagian works have wrought mightily, it is most true, upon the Catholic Church, and have held in check the Pelagianizing tendencies of the hierarchical and monastic system, but they have never passed into blood and marrow. They waited for a favorable future, and nourished in silence an opposition to the prevailing system.

Even in the middle age the better sects, which attempted to simplify, purify, and spiritualize the reigning Christianity by return to the Holy Scriptures, and the reformers before the Reformation, such as Wiclif, Huss, and Wessel, resorted most, after the apostle Paul, to the bishop of Hippo, as the representative of the doctrines of free grace.

The Reformers were led by his writings into a deeper understanding of Paul, and so prepared for their great vocation. No church teacher did so much to mould Luther and Calvin; none furnished them so powerful weapons against the dominant Pelagianism and formalism; none is so often quoted by them with esteem and love.

All the Reformers in the outset, Melanchthon and Zwingli among them, adopted his denial of free will and his doctrine of predestination, and sometimes even went beyond him into the abyss of supralapsarianism, to cut out the last roots of human merit and boasting. In this point Augustine holds the same relation to the Catholic Church, as Luther to the Lutheran; that is, he is a heretic of unimpeachable authority, who is more admired than censured even in his extravagances; yet his doctrine of predestination was *indirectly* condemned by the pope in Jansenism, as Luther's view was rejected as Calvinism by the Form of Concord. For Jansenism was nothing but a revival of Augustinianism in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church.

The excess of Augustine and the Reformers, in this direction, is due to the earnestness and energy of their sense of sin and grace. The Pelagian looseness could never beget a reformer. It was only the unshaken conviction of man's own inability, of unconditional dependence on God, and of the almighty power of His grace to give us strength for every good work, which could do this. He who would give others the conviction that he has a divine vocation for the Church and for mankind, must himself be penetrated with the faith of an eternal, unalterable decree of God, and must cling to it in the darkest hours.

In great men, and only in great men, great opposites and, apparently, antagonistic truths live together. Small minds cannot hold them. The catholic, churchly, sacramental, and sacerdotal system stands in conflict with the evangelical Protestant Christianity of subjective, personal experience. The doctrine of universal baptismal regeneration, in particular, which pre-supposes a universal call (at least within the Church), can on principles of logic hardly be united with the doctrine of an absolute predestination, which limits the decree of redemption to a portion of the baptized. Augustine supposes, on the one hand, that every baptized person, through the inward operation of the Holy Ghost, which accompanies the outward act of the sacrament, receives the forgiveness of sins, and is translated from the state of nature into the state of grace, and thus, *qua baptizatus*, is also a child of God and an heir of eternal life; and yet, on the other hand, he makes all these benefits dependent on the absolute will of God, who saves only a certain number out of the "mass of perdition," and preserves these to the end. Regeneration and election, with him, do not, as with Calvin, coincide. The former may exist without the latter, but the latter cannot exist without the former. Augustine assumes that many are actually born into the kingdom of grace only to perish again; Calvin holds that, in the case of the non-elect, baptism is an unmeaning ceremony; the one putting the delusion in the inward effect, the other in the outward form. The sacramental, churchly system throws the main stress upon the baptismal regeneration to the injury of the eter-

nal election; the Calvinistic and Puritan system sacrifices the virtue of the sacrament to the election; the Lutheran and Anglican system seeks a middle ground, without being able to give a satisfactory theological solution of the problem. The Anglican Church allows the two opposite views, and sanctions the one in the baptismal service of the Book of Common Prayer, the other in her Thirty-nine Articles, which are moderately Calvinistic.

It was an evident ordering of God, that the Augustinian system, like the Latin Bible of Jerome, appeared just in that transitional period of history, in which the old civilization was passing away before the flood of barbarism, and a new order of things, under the guidance of the Christian religion, was in preparation. The Church, with her strong, imposing organization and her firm system of doctrine, must save Christianity amidst the chaotic turmoil of the great migration, and must become a training-school for the barbarian nations of the middle age.

In this process of training, next to the Holy Scriptures, the scholarship of Jerome and the theology and fertile ideas of Augustine were the most important intellectual agent.

Augustine was held in so universal esteem, that he could exert influence in all directions, and even in his excesses gave no offence. He was sufficiently catholic for the principle of Church authority, and yet at the same time so free and evangelical, that he modified its hierarchical and sacramental character, re-acted against its tendencies to outward, mechanical, ritualism, and kept alive a deep consciousness of sin and grace, and a spirit of fervent and truly Christian piety, until that spirit grew strong enough to break the shell of hierarchical tutelage, and enter a new stage of its development. No other father could have acted more beneficently on the Catholicism of the middle age, and more successfully provided for the evangelical Reformation than St. Augustine, the worthy successor of Paul, and the precursor of Luther and Calvin.

Had he lived at the time of the Reformation, he would, in all probability, have taken the lead of the evangelical movement

against the prevailing Pelagianism of the Roman Church. For we must not forget that, notwithstanding their strong affinity there is an important difference between Catholicism and Romanism or Popery. They sustain a similar relation to each other as the Judaism of the Old Testament dispensation which looked, and prepared the way for Christianity, and the Judaism after the crucifixion, and after the destruction of Jerusalem which is antagonistic to Christianity. Catholicism covers the entire ancient and mediæval history of the Church, and includes the Pauline, Augustinian or evangelical tendencies, which increased with the corruptions of the papacy and the growing sense of the necessity of a reformation *in capite et membris.* Romanism proper dates from the Council of Trent, which gave it symbolical expression and anathematized the doctrines of the Reformation. Catholicism is the strength of Romanism, Romanism is the weakness of Catholicism. Catholicism produced Jansenism, popery condemned it. Popery never forgets and never learns anything, and can allow no change in doctrine, without sacrificing the fundamental principle of infallibility, and thus committing suicide. But Catholicism may, ultimately, burst the chains of popery, which have so long kept it confined, and may assume new life and vigor.

Such a personage as Augustine, still holding a mediating place between the two great divisions of Christendom, revered alike by both, and of equal influence with both, is, furthermore, a welcome pledge of the elevating prospect of a future reconciliation of Catholicism and Protestantism in a higher unity, conserving all the truths, losing all the errors, forgiving all the sins, forgetting all the enmities of both. After all, the contradiction between authority and freedom, the objective and the subjective, the churchly and the personal, the organic and the individual, the sacramental and the experimental in religion, is not absolue, but relative and temporary, arising not so much from the nature of things, as from the deficiencies of man's knowledge and piety in the present order of things. They admit of an ultimate harmony in the perfect state of the Church, corresponding to the union of the divine and human natures

which transcends the limits of finite thought and logical comprehension, and yet is completely realized in the person of Christ. They are, in fact, united in the theological system of St. Paul, who had the highest view of the Church as the "body of Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all," and who was at the same time the chief champion of evangelical freedom and personal responsibility. WE BELIEVE IN AND HOPE FOR ONE HOLY CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH, ONE COMMUNION OF SAINTS, ONE FOLD AND ONE SHEPHERD. The more the different Churches become truly Christian, or draw nearer to Christ, and the more they give real effect to His kingdom, the nearer will they come to one another. For Christ is the common head and vital centre of all believers, and the divine harmony of all discordant human creeds. IN CHRIST, says Pascal, one of the greatest and noblest disciples of Augustine, IN CHRIST ALL CONTRADICTIONS ARE SOLVED.*

* MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY, so called, has aimed from the beginning to harmonize, from the christological centre, the principle of authority and the principle of freedom, the objective and the subjective, the Catholic and the Evangelical elements of Christianity. *Evangelical Catholicism* was, and is still, its motto. It stands as much opposed to Romanism and Romanizing tendencies, as to radical, unchurchly Protestantism. It strongly defended, at the very beginning of its course, and still maintains the fundamental principle of Protestantism concerning the absolute supremacy of the Bible in matters of faith and practice, and the justification of the sinner by free grace through faith in Christ. It has, moreover, always taught the great law of historical development and steady progress. But, to Romanize is to go backward, to turn the stream up hill, to stultify the history of the last three hundred years, and to give the lie to the Saviour's promise of an unbroken presence with his disciples to the end of time—a promise which is as gloriously and palpably fulfilled in the history of Protestant Churches, as in the palmiest ages of Catholicism, not excluding the age of martyrs and confessors. Holland, alone, has furnished more martyrs, under the terrible reign of Alba, to the Reformed faith, than the whole Christian Church during the second and third centuries. Protestant Germany, alone, has sung more hymns of praise to Christ, than the entire Latin and Greek Churches. The British and American Bible Society, alone, circulate more copies of the Scriptures in one year, than were propagated in fifteen centuries before the Reformation. The free Church of Scotland, or Puritan New England, alone, contribute more money, annually, for the spread of the Gospel, and for Christian education and benevolence, at home and abroad, than the whole of Southern Europe and South America, or the vast Russian empire. It betrays ignorance or prejudice, or theological dyspepsia, to deny or to be insensible to these stubborn facts. "By their fruits ye shall know them." As long as Christ is with Protestantism, it matters very little who is against it.

"He, and no other one,
Shall conquer in the battle."

Art. VII.—CHRISTIAN PATRIOTISM.

BY MOSES KIEFFER, D. D., PROFESSOR IN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, TIFFIN, OHIO.

In the course of our miscellaneous reading, we have seen it stated substantially that, to understand any subject fully, we must first consider it *absolutely; i. e.*, as it is in its own nature, and as it differs essentially from every thing else. If we fail in this, our thoughts will be confused and our conceptions inadequate. This being done, it is equally important to consider the same subject in the various transitions through which it passes in reaching the highest degree of development peculiar to itself, and also the various relations by which it is affiliated and joined, in every direction, to other things. If we fail in this, our ideas will be purely speculative, or abstract, and can never come to any practical bearing. In fact, the created universe is one; nothing in it exists for itself, just as little as any man liveth to himself:

> "Look round the world,
> Behold a chain of love
> Uniting all below
> And all above—
> All things serving—
> All things served—
> Nothing stands alone;
> The chain runs on,
> And where it ends unknown."

Both errors here alluded to are the same in principle, namely, that of abstraction. The one is exemplified by the speculative Philosophy, and the other by the common sense, or utilitarian, Philosophy. For this very reason, neither one of these systems can be complete in itself. Utilitarianism may show one object serves another, or of what use it is to another, and how this again serves one more remote; but, our thinking powers being finite, we must end somewhere: *i. e.*, we must ultimately arrive

at an object which has its end in itself. Beyond this, the system can neither see nor go; the calculations of the understanding are at an end. Idealism, on the other hand (equally separatistic and abstract), lives in the region of the clouds, or above the clouds rather; it is occupied, to a great extent, with ideas that are everlasting—"ideas that were never born and can never die."

The true Philosophy, the Christian, unites and harmonizes all that is true in the opposite systems named, instinctively throwing off their respective errors. Its ground-principle is neither the objective nor the subjective, but faith in the Absolute; in whom all things consist, and for whose honor and glory they were created: in other words, *faith in the Christos*, in whom dwells the fulness of the Godhead, and also the fulness of humanity, by whom the whole family of heaven and of earth is named, in whom the supernatural comes to its fullest revelation, and in whom alone the natural comes to its ultimate meaning.

But it is easier to state rules than to practice them, much easier to point out errors than to avoid them, easier even to point out the way of truth than to walk in it. This acknowledgment we make the more readily, inasmuch as we have undertaken to write on a subject which, with all our study, we cannot fully understand or apprehend, but can only know certainly that we are apprehended by it. Our statements may serve as an apology, however, for baptizing our subject in the Christian name; and we trust that every other subject, that may be discussed in this Review, may participate largely in the same holy baptism. To be christological and Christian, is to be truly "Reformed."

By this, it is not meant, by any means, that the large class of persons who have never been made partakers of the Saviour's anointing, have no patriotic feeling. History teaches that millions of such have willingly sacrificed their lives for their country's good, and at the present time there are many thousands in our own land who are ready to suffer and to die for the maintenance and for the honor of the national government.

Patriotism may be found certainly in the sphere of nature merely, and it is as *natural* as the love of kindred. It cannot be demonstrated first as a duty, on the ground that it may serve many useful ends; but, on the contrary, we reason from the feeling already existing, and then we find what a powerful agency it is for good. It is conceded that *interest* is also a powerful motive to human action; but of itself, it fails to secure many valuable ends: a vastly more powerful motive is SYMPATHY; and, in many instances, it supersedes interest, or at least throws it so far in the back-ground as to leave it entirely out of view.

Illustrations of this truth are near at hand. The institution of the marriage relation, for instance, did not originally, nor does it now, notwithstanding the utilitarian tendencies of the age, ground itself upon the calculations of the understanding; but upon a deep and mysterious sympathy. Who would suppose for a moment, that the thousands who are yearly conducted to the hymenial altar, are influenced by no deeper or higher motive than that of interest? There is no attempt made even to calculate or to sum up the anticipated joys and pleasures of the new relation. It is a peculiar sympathy that attracts them and weds them more closely than any other motive possibly could do. Neither does the devoted young husband, when he shows a peculiar attachment to his wife, mean to say by his conduct that he has been favored with the very best and loveliest of the fair daughters of Eve. Other gentlemen may have wives equally as beautiful and as good as his, and many of them may be even much more attractive, yet he gives to his own wife his heart's best devotion. His attachments to her are peculiar, in perfect accordance, too, with the Scriptural commandment: "Husbands, love your wives." This deep and mysterious sympathy is a great and powerful reality, whose presence we must all acknowledge, though it may not square with our notions of the useful.

We are also commanded to love our parents; which means to love, to honor and respect them in particular. But in obeying this commandment, we neither mean to say that our parents are

better than all the rest of mankind, nor that we hate others. The commandment directs our attention simply to the lawful and natural effect of a peculiar sympathy, and the callousness of the heart in which this primary sympathy does not exist—a sympathy indispensably necessary to the physical, the intellectual, the moral and religious progress of mankind. Yet neither can this be proved or calculated by the understanding. In many cases, indeed, the parents may not deserve the warm thanks of their offspring; they may have done no more for them than, under the common relations of society, they could not well help doing. The children may have many reasons for dissatisfaction; but filial love is not on that account extinguished.

So it is precisely with patriotism. The combined powers of association, in all their varieties, from the nursery song to the highest national epic, from the innocent plays of childhood to the grave realities of old age, from the discipline of the primary school to the drama of public life, from the day of the nation's birth to the most recent legislative enactments, from the struggle for national independence up to the still more fearful struggle in defence of national life, the past and the present, the particular and the general, things and persons, joys and sorsows, the objective and the subjective, the land, the climate, the people, the society, the laws and customs, the literature, the sciences and the arts, morals and religion, take hold upon us, and we love our country. We love it in particular, though we need not, on that account, hate other countries. In the abstract, we might value other countries more highly than our own. We might say: "I believe if I were to be born again, and had my choice, with my present knowledge and without my present feelings, I would choose such other country," and yet, such as we now are, we love our own country peculiarly, because it is our home. As the Christian Church is the mother of the faithful, so is the country the mother of the citizens inhabiting it. We may see her imperfections, and raise our voices and use our influence against her follies and her vices; yet we feel that within us which moved Sir John Eliot calmly

to give over in trust, to friends, his large estate, and to make provision for the education of his children, then to go to the great, warm, ruffling Parliament of 1626, where he expected, and unfortunately met with the danger for which he was prepared: he fell, a martyr to his country. We feel that within us which leads us to admire the character of an Eversteen of Holland, whose father and four brothers had fallen by the hand of the enemy, who, nevertheless, asked for re-appointment in service, that he might, likewise, fall on the same bed of honor. For the same reason, also, we honor and respect an Aristides, whom injustice banished, and who still loved Athens. But it is not enough for us to know that we possess, or rather that we are possessed by this feeling; the question arises, is it right that it is so? Is it, after all, a PRIMARY sympathy? Or is it not a feeling within us which grounds itself upon our nature as it had been affected by sin?

In the actual history of the world, the natural and the sinful, it must be confessed, are very closely and intimately connected. The grand development of human life is abnormal. All flesh has corrupted its way before God. Hence, we usually say, that we are, by nature, so corrupt that we are incapable of doing any good, and inclined to all evil. The entire stream of human life is poisoned in its fountain. Yet, notwithstanding the depths of human depravity, the sinful has not destroyed the natural. God is still in history, and in virtue of His gracious presence, our common humanity has not been blotted out of existence. Man is still man, though fallen and depraved. Sin is not essential to human nature, nor to the development of human life; it is an "accidens." For this very reason man has never sunken so low as to be without any notion of virtue and religion. His religion may have taken the form of Paganism; but he is constitutionally religious, nevertheless. His virtue may have taken the form of mere courage, as among the Romans, still courage is a virtue. So with all the primary sympathies of our nature; they develop abnormally. Self-love degenerates into selfishness, family love into family pride, and patriotism or love of country, often degenerates into national

pride and vanity. Of this, history gives us many examples, from the Chinese to the English, and from these again to the Americans. We, like the English, are patriotic, but whether they or we have the most national pride, it is difficult to tell. Both nations are, perhaps, as much inflated as they can be. But the abnormal presupposes the normal, unbelief presupposes faith, selfishness, however, paradoxical it may seem, has its origin in self-love; family pride originates in family love, and national pride grounds itself in the love of country. While national pride then is a sin, patriotism is a virtue no less than family love.

Now, the great design of Christianity, as a redemptive scheme, is to separate the natural from the sinful, to save man in the totality of his being, from his sins and all its sad consequences. In order to this, humanity must be regenerated: *i. e.*, the mystery of the Saviour's Incarnation must actualize itself in bringing man from his abnormal state into the normal. Just here we find the true idea of Catholicity. Christianity, purifying the fountain of human life, also sanctifies it in all the higher stages of its development, and in all its relations. While there is a constant warfare going on between holiness and sin, between truth and error, Christ and Satan, there is no conflict, as we see, between Christianity and nature, between the divine and the human. On the contrary, the latter is taken up into the sphere of the former, and is sanctified by its gracious presence and power.

From this, we may lawfully infer, that all the primary sympathies and all the essential characteristics of human nature are or may become Christian; and again, we may infer that Christ, from whom all Christian life proceeds, possesses all the primary sympathies and all the essential characteristics of human nature. If, then, that peculiar sympathy which we have denominated love of country or patriotism, is possessed by our blessed Saviour, and by His prophets and apostles, the question before us is fully settled. Then it is right, it is a virtue, and in its purest form, it is a Christian virtue. Here, there is no room left us for misgivings or doubts. We hear a holy prophet exclaim,

when beholding in prophetic vision the desolations of his country: "Is there no balm in Gilead, is there no physician there, why, then, is not the health of the daughter of my people recovered?" The apostle Paul, animated by the same feeling, says, in glowing words: "I could wish myself accursed from God for my countrymen, my kinsmen, according to the flesh." And the Prophet of all the prophets, the Apostle of all the apostles, exclaims in tears of sympathy: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often I would have gathered thy children together as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, but ye would not."

This is a pure and holy love of kindred, or, which is the same thing, love of country. It is by no means in conflict with general benignity; yet its own peculiarity is clearly and distinctly marked. Hence the Saviour, though He takes the whole world into the arms of His everlasting love, nevertheless commanded those whom He entrusted with the work of preaching His gospel, to commence at Jerusalem. And though He now lives in His glorified form in heaven, is not Jerusalem still His chief joy. Is not Zion the place, the country, which He honors with His peculiar presence and love? Is not the Church His bride, and is she not the purchase of His precious blood? His eyes are upon all countries, upon all the nations and families of the earth; but He only looks with complacency upon those who bear His image and dwell where His honor dwelleth: *i. e.*, in Zion.

But the country in which Christ has established His Church, partakes more or less of her character. The government, the laws, the institutions, and the customs of the country, are no longer pagan, but Christian. The majority of the people may not have made a formal profession of the Christain faith, yet the nation, as a whole, now bears the Christian name. Under this general view, we may say, that Christian patriotism bears the same relation to natural patriotism, or to the natural love of country, as Christianity itself bears to all other forms of religion. Over against these, it proves itself to be the only true,

the absolute religion. So, Christian patriotism is the purest, the holiest, and the best. As among the heathen, we have many instances of disinterestedness and of self-sacrifice, so in the sphere of mere nature there may be an ardent and glowing patriotism, stronger than the love of life. This, we must admit, because for all the nobler pursuits of life there is a primary impulse. The farmer, the mechanic, the merchant, the artist, the philosopher, the lawyer, the physician, the clergyman, certainly do not, or at least ought not, to pursue their respective callings from a love of gain or from motives of interest. The love of industry, of physical and mental activity—the love of the true, the beautiful and the good, are the primary motives to action. But in the sphere of a fallen and depraved nature, all primary impulses and sympathies develop themselves abnormally, as the world's entire history clearly proves. The only form of normal development is our holy Christian religion. In this form alone, the natural love of country can reach the high and holy ends of its being. Without the sanctifying presence of this supernatural power, it soon degenerates into a sort of clanishness, a petty and selfish feeling, the utmost extent of which is the town limit—"a despicable interestedness:" or it degenerates into national egotism, which is blind to truth and callous to justice beyond the nation's frontier, and which has been used for various evil ends, so much so, that even good men have not been wanting, who have not only looked upon patriotism itself as beneath a true elevation of mind, but have actually declaimed against it. If patriotism consisted in national vanity, pride, conceitedness, self-sufficiency, which are its counterfeits, and one or the other of which we meet with in every nation of the globe, it should be avoided by every good man; the bitter weed should be plucked up by the roots. But is it so? Does there not exist a real Christian virtue, compatible with purity of heart and general good will, which is deeply planted in the human breast, and which has produced the best effects in civil communities? Of a natural virtue, apart from Christianity, we do not speak. The fruits of Paradise are not usually seen upon the tree of the old Adamic nature. We need

not compare the apples of Eden with those of Sodom to learn how good they are: we can learn this lesson thoroughly, also, by comparing the possession of a good with its absence or its its want.

Without true patriotic spirit, men separate into different sects, hostile parties, and interest alone fails to supply the bond. Interest may unite a community for a time, but it may also become a bone of contention, of discord, and of party strife. Those Asiatic tribes which, for centuries, have passed from one conqueror to another, or Rome, ever since the downfall of the Republic, give us melancholy instances of the absence of patriotism. In the work of Sismondi, on the Italian Republics in the middle ages, may be found the following remarkable passage: "Italy, toward the end of the eighteenth century, had always soldiers, riches, a large population, flourishing agriculture, commerce and manufactures, which presented still great resources, men versed in the sciences, others whom nature had made fit to acquire them soon; but the feeling and life were wanting; and when the French revolution broke out, there was not one in Europe who could not see that Italy had neither the will nor the power to defend her independence, and that a nation which had no longer a country, could not resist, either to defend itself or its neighbors."

Mr. Raumer, a celebrated German historian, speaking of the endless sufferings to which Germany was exposed by Louis XIV., says: "So it always will be when the Germans forget that they have one common country, and ought to have one common national feeling, into however many parts they may be politically divided."

We have another striking example of the absence of patriotism in the history of the South American States after they had broken their allegiance with Spain. Mr. Chivalier, for instance, in his letters written from Mexico, in the year 1837, said: "Insurrections have become an act of mere common life: there have gradually been established well-defined forms for it, which, like the noble game of tric-trac, admit of no deviation. The proceedure is sufficiently simple, and in Mexico sufficiently

humane likewise; it resembles, if not a battle at the opera, at all events a harmless enough guerilla warfare. The first act of revolution consists in an officer, of any grade, from that of general to that of any lieutenant, downwards, pronouncing himself against the established order of things, or any institution he does not approve of, or any thing else of any description. He collects a party, a company or a regiment, who generally hasten to place themselves at his disposal. The second act of revolution is called the "Cry," in which the motives and objects of the insurrection are reduced to three or four heads or articles. When the subject is of some importance, the "Cry" assumes the name of "Plan." In the third act, the insurgents and the partizans of the government come into each other's presence. There are skirmishes of their respective forces. In the fourth, they come to action definitely. But, according to the improvements which have been introduced lately, in the art of revolution making, this is done in the most guarded manner, and at the most respectful distance. There must, however, be a victor and vanquished. If you are beaten, you unpronounce yourself; if victorious, you march upon Mexico. In the fifth and last act, the conqueror, whoever he is, makes his triumphal entry into the capital, while the vanquished embarks at Vera Cruz or Tampico, with all the honors of war."

May our country never come into their secret. But, alas! alas! we have fallen upon perilous times. Political parties are arrayed against each other. Republicans have become black-republicans, black abolitionists, and the democrats have become red, red copperheads. The country has but lately been involved in a dreadful civil war. Many and conflicting are the opinions in regard to its cause. Some say it was African slavery in the Southern States, others maintain it was the fanatical abolitionism of the North; some say this, and others that; and as every one claims a right to his own opinion, we claim the privilege also of expressing ours.

It may be possible that if slavery had not existed in our country, the evil of war would not have come upon us. It is quite likely, too, that if that institution had not been disturbed

by public sentiment, the South would not have rebelled against the government of our common country; but it is certain, in our opinion, slavery or no slavery, abolition or no abolition, political divisions or no such divisions, that the whole evil came from the absence of a holy Christian patriotism. Where this is present and rules supreme in the land, no matter how great the conflict of political opinion, no matter how great and fearful the clashing of sectional interests, no class of persons can entertain, for a moment, the idea of taking up arms against their country, whether it be their native land or the land of their adoption. He who loves slavery, or his political opinions and plans more than his country, is not a patriot. He who loves property, or honor, or even his own life, more than his country, is not a Christian patriot. Patriotism is the religion of liberty; it strives to overcome all the evils that afflict the land in the way of oppression and wrong, in every form; it pronounces its benediction upon all classes of men. But like every other form of love, "it is not puffed up, it behaveth itself not unseemly;" it is not radical; it proceeds mostly in noiseless ways; it would overcome all sin and evil with spiritual and moral weapons. The true patriot will be faithful in the discharge of all private and domestic duties; because the public, the community, have an interest in the individual and the family. He feels that it would not be consistent for him to deliver public lectures on education while his own children are growing up in ignorance. Yet he will always be ready to serve the public, to vote at elections, to support the schools, the churches, and above all, the government. This is a power ordained of God, and he yields to it all due respect and obedience in the Lord.

Here is the true ground and nature of civil freedom. It is not the right of the people to do, each one as he listeth; it is the harmony of the individual will and practice with the law of God as revealed in the form of national government. Patriotism brings affection into the State; it is its "primum mobile," and without it no government, especially no republican form of government, can long exist, as we may easily see from the examples already adduced. It produces a oneness between

the government, as the jural institution of the country, and the governed, as the aggregate of living men, with their associations arising out of their history and soil; "it stands between the abstract demand of justice and the love of kindred;" and then it reveals itself in the form of loyalty, that is, a warm attachment to the institutions of the country, and an upright desire to act according to the true spirit of its laws.

In monarchical governments, loyalty has often been used to designate the warm attachment of the people to the royal person, which has not unfrequently existed indeed, but also often been supposed to exist when the real feeling was for the country—a distinction which was seen as soon as the monarch ceased to represent the country. The attachment is warmest for the country, the land, the people, their history, &c., that for a king, personally, must always be comparatively weak in a widely extended country, whose reminiscenses are truly national. This is well understood by military officers, who, when they would excite their soldiers to deeds of the most noble daring, appeal to their love of country. Thus, when Nelson, before the battle of Trafalgar, meant to inspire his sailors, addressed them in tones of thunder: "England expects every man this day to do his duty." It told well. If he had said: "parliament expects," the appeal would have been weaker, but not without some effect, because parliament is a great national institution. But it would certainly have stirred no soul if he had said: "George the III. expects every man this day to do his duty." At the battle of Waterloo, Wellington, who could not be eloquent, to inspire his soldiers, cried out: "We must not be beat; what will they say in England, if we are beaten to-day?" Napoleon, at the famous battle of the Pyramids, that he might awaken in his army every latent spark of patriotic feeling, addressed them thus: "Frenchmen," then pointing to the pyramids, said: "Forty centuries are now looking down upon you, to see whether every man will this day do his duty."

Here we find, also, the true reason why it is that, under the guidance of a righteous God, the armies of our nation triumphed over the equally formidable forces of those who were arrayed

for a period of four years against their country's government. And as we may now take lessons of wisdom from the history of the past, let us ever remember that the flag of our national union can only continue to wave triumphantly over our widely extended country, provided its staff be supported and held erect by the hallowed presence of that stronger staff, which bears the blood-stained banner of the cross of Christ.

Art. VIII.—GOD IN HISTORY AND IN SCIENCE.

BY LEWIS H. STEINER.

Our age presents so much that is in advance of its predecessors that we are all given to forgetfulness of its connection with the past. We look back upon its records, not with the fondness which makes the child linger over the deeds of its fathers, not with the affection which fills a filial heart as it ponders over the perilous trials and struggles of an honored ancestry,—but with the indifference of one related by no tie of blood or affection to those whose lives and deeds fill such records. The past, at first glance, seems so cold, repugnant and lifeless, that we turn away and content ourselves with enjoying the rich scenes of advance and progress furnished by the present. Here there is life and energy and vigor. The very air is musical with the triumphs of science. Steam—the mighty servant of man—is ever showing its adaptation to some new use, and adding new trophies to the thousands which decorate its niche in the temple of science. Electricity bends to man's power and carries his messages over land and under water, or labors to increase the value of baser metals by covering them with layers of silver and gold. Gunpowder invests war with a power unknown before, and increases the bloody trophies of the conquering hero. These are the magicians that have thrown a weird attractive-

ness over the present; while the art of printing gives the character of permanence and durability to their triumphs.—Bewildered with the riches of modern discovery, and besotted with pride at our fancied superiority over the past, we have learned to look upon it as a species of misty chaos from which the present has emerged, as Aurora, bright and beautiful, from the dark waters of the sea.

A false idea of history and an unsound Philosophy have caused us to lose sight of the intimate connection which exists between all ages of the world. The teachings of history are considered as merely the querulous notes of an old grandam, in a condition of second-childhood, that are harsh and discordant when compared with the ravishing melodies of the present. *We* have thrown away childish things and grown to man's estate; it is beneath *our* dignity to ponder over the first beginnings of history, when ignorance prevailed over the earth. And our pride does not even stop here. Forgetting the steps by which our present Republic has attained its eminent renown, we too frequently deny to all other forms of government the possession of any merit—to all other peoples the presence of virtues and blessings that are here found liberally bestowed by a beneficent Providence. We have accustomed ourselves to look upon history only as a dark back-ground in contrast with the beauties of our own government and the blessings which science has showered over our paths.

It may be productive of more humility, if we investigate, the blessings of History and Natural Science, from the standpoint of anxious enquirers after truth, which, in all its forms, is ever nearer to the faithful and zealous student than his most sanguine hopes would lead him to expect. Such investigation must result in the discovery of the relation that the past holds to the present, both parts of a grand process—an organism that, from the first, is perfectly adapted for all the needs of humanity, and, while developing new organs and new powers, continues perfectly adapted for the duties and tasks which God has assigned it, only introducing scientific discoveries and great human leaders when the wants of the world are clamorous for

them. It will teach us that steam, electricity, and gunpowder would have been useless to mankind in the early ages of the world. It will show, that it is only when a crowded population begins to cultivate commerce, that diplomacy is created for the purpose of quieting difficulties incident to the same, and that wars result as means of settling what diplomacy has failed to secure. In early times, the inhabitants of the earth had its fertile plains and well-watered valleys before them. They could select whatever place of abode pleased them most, and enjoy, in the simplicity of their wants, the products which the virgin soil bountifully furnished. If a strife arose between "the herdmen of Abram's cattle and the herdmen of Lot's cattle," the patriarch could say: "Is not the whole land before thee? separate thyself, I pray thee, from me: if thou will take the left hand, then I will go to the right; or if thou depart to the right hand, then I will go to the left." In such a condition of nomadic simplicity, happiness and liberty, what need was there of the appliances of modern science? what need of trial by jury, the elective franchise, popular sovereignty, national banks, cheap postage, and the thousand other necessities of modern governments? The head of the family was then appointed, by the great Ruler in the skies, absolute lawgiver to his people, and rendered account alone to the Being, from whence his authority came, for the proper discharge of his duties. Wants were few and simple, and the knowledge of the times was fully adequate for their supply: when the former increased in number and complexity, the latter also increased. Through all, a wise Providence is seen presiding over the wants of the world. Discoveries were only made when the need was greatest, when the wants of men were clamorous for relief. Then, and not till then, did the discoverer (generally in ignorance of his high mission as a select servant of the Deity) announce, to the world, the result of his labors and the conclusions he had attained under the guidance of a higher power. Does not this coincidence of discovery with the existence of urgent need show something more than mere chance? Does it not prove the existence of an actual Providence in the minut-

est events of history, as well as in the startling discoveries of science? Let us banish blind chance from our studies, and recognize a Power, directly interested in, and acting for, the welfare of humanity, which connects the records of history and the results of science into a living organism, ever budding and blossoming forth new forms of utility and beauty.

We propose to glance at the evidences afforded by History and Science of the existence of a Providence regulating and controlling their course, or, in other words, to direct attention to "God in History and Science." Our task will be best accomplished without rigid adherence to a logical treatment of the subject. We simply need, for its discussion, a comprehensive view of the beginnings of both History and Science, together with the facts connected with the appearance of the world's heroes and the treasures of Science.

What is History? Does it consist in mere catalogues of Kings and Princes, who have directed the destinies of nations for years, and then have been gathered to their fathers,—in detailed accounts of deeds of military prowess where physical superiority triumphed over its weaker brother,—in narratives of feuds and intestine broils;—or, even in long lists of names designating orators, philosophers, statesmen and warriors who have toiled for the good of mankind? Does it really consist of the dry, barren detail, which has, for years, formed the substance of all our School Text-Books and Compends? Has it no more life, no more organic dependence between its particles than a pile of sand, in which grains of gold may be concealed, although the preponderance of baser substances effectually prevents their discovery? If such a view were correct, we might well understand, although from a higher stand-point they would be unintelligible, the words that Bulwer puts into the mouth of Richelieu—

> "History preserves only the fleshless bones
> Of what we are—and by the mocking skull
> The would-be wise pretend to guess the features!
> Without the roundness and the glow of life
> How hideous is the skeleton!"

Such a view being correct, the study of History becomes a dry and uninviting task, and the propriety of devoting much time to it is at least debatable. There is, however, a loftier plane occupied by history, under the influences of a truer recognition of its meaning. Listen to the words of an earnest thinker: "*It is the way of God in the world.* It proceeds "not blindly nor by chance; but it is a process by which the "purpose or plan of the divine mind is continually carried forward, "among men, towards its given end. In this view it is not "simply a mechanical arrangement, over which God may be "supposed to preside in an outward way, as a man conducting "a game of chess, or a general directing the movements of "his army. The process itself is the divine purpose, moving "forward by necessary self-explication at every point, to the full "resolution of the end involved in it from the beginning. * * * "It is not made up of loose fragments confusedly thrown "together; but forms, in all its parts, a great organic whole "that developes itself continually according to a law involved "in its own nature. * * * It includes an objective force, "which is wholly beyond and independent of all individual will; "and that carries forward the counsels of the Almighty, from "generation to generation, without regard to the conciousness "or purpose of any particular generation separately taken."

Looking at History from such a point of view, the obscurity of its beginnings will not prevent us reading the lessons it teaches, or profiting by the instructions thus obtained. We find no difficulty in understanding the life and character of any single individual, although we are absolutely ignorant of the place of his nativity and of the incidents that may have marked the early months of his existence; nor are we the less assured of our own personal identity, because our memory does not extend back to the period when we were absolutely dependent upon the solicitude and attentions of others. It is the general tone and spirit of a man that we seek to know; knowing these, we are satisfied as to the principles that will control and influence him. In like manner, minuteness of detail is not essential to the proper understanding of the history of any par-

ticular period,—much less of its whole course from the first creation of man down to its end, when the purposes for which he has been created shall have been fulfilled. The faithful student of History seeks after its philosophy, and, although ignorant of dates, and possessed of a memory treacherous as to events, thus obtains an idea of its life, more correct and real than that obtained by him, who has made his brain a mere storehouse for the deposition of dry facts and the storage of frightful columns of figures. There is life and the glow of health in man, although he may be innocent of any knowledge of the anatomy of his body, the curious construction of its internal organs, and the perfect adaptation of all to specific purposes. Indeed, a thought concerning the anatomical structure of one we love, seems to remove some part of that attraction which has made him acceptable to our soul. We love the friend without caring for such accidents of his structure, and our love needs not knowledge of that kind to increase its fervor, or even to retain its present glow. The mere anatomist, confined to descriptions of lifeless structure, becomes a proverbial illustration of dryness,—while the physiologist, whose studies are directed towards the mysteries of the very same structure when animated with all the functions of life, lives in a higher sphere of mental labor. But our estimate of a loved one does not rest upon the light either Anatomy or Physiology can shed; it is formed from an acquaintance with his character in its entirety. Even where our admiration is claimed by mere physical beauty, we are not able, in the larger number of instances, to specify the particular point of attraction, but are simply forced to acknowledge the bewitching power of the whole. Similarly, we may become acquainted with History without much assistance from *its* anatomy—tables of chronology—and may learn to understand, and even love it, without the necessity of knowing all the incidents which fill its pages.

Looking upon History as organically connected in all its parts, and not a mere succession of events following each other fortuitously, the relation of great men to their ages becomes quite intelligible. The hero is not the creator of the spirit of his

age; the latter has not formed its manners, habits, or tastes in accordance with any directive force he has exercised. The age has produced him,—has called him forth from the people in which he lived,—has invested him with the duty of speaking the thoughts that were vainly striving for utterance from the mouths of his fellow-men, and, giving him authority and power over the latter, has bidden them obey him as the true expression of their wants,—the representative of its own very inmost meaning. No man can be really in advance of his age. His mind may have caught prophetic glimpses of future discoveries, or of mighty revolutions, involved in all the haze and gloom which precede the rising of the sun, but the fact that he was not the man, to bring the former before the world or to control the tumultous nature of the latter, was clearly shown in the indisposition of the age to put itself under his lead. Every age is a stadium in the progress of humanity; it is not the result of any one man's plans or wishes, be his intellect never so comprehensive and all-grasping. When the fullness of time has been reached, whatever may be the needs of a people, whom God designs shall be led on to victory in war, or to the bloodless triumphs of scientific discovery, whatever, then may be its needs and requirements, the proper hero appears and is made to assume the position for which his heaven-born commission has designated him. A belief in this is not mere submission to the issues of blind fatalism,—but it arises from faith in the Providence of God, whose ways are shown throughout the records of History, even should these often be incomprehensible to our weak and feeble intellects. A glance at the past will test the correctness of this position. A Moses, a Samuel, a David, a Daniel only made their appearance when the direct necessities of the Jews required them, and hence, their recognition as men specially raised up by the true source of all authority. In like manner we may be able to understand the so-called "divine right of kings," and the wonderful readiness with which people placed themselves under the lead of a Cromwell, a Bonaparte and a Washington. And the whole history of the late war showed how man's designs must be subordinated to

God's ways. At first our trust was placed in man alone. The Commander-in-Chief of our army was supposed to be the sole hope and reliance of the nation. It was claimed that, under his guidance, we should be led through the wilderness of anarchy into the land of promise. Rout and defeat followed at Bull Run. The disaster was attributed to the want of organization, and a leader specially fitted for such duty was placed in power. A measure of success attended our efforts, but there was want of unity of action on the part of the army, and of promptness in pressing campaigns on the part of the General,—and when the work of organization had been completed, this commander was compelled to give way to others. For a while we were in a state of confusion, with our grand armies operating independently of each other. But the time having arrived for the decisive step which should close the war, we were enabled to recognize the man whom the age had produced, and to give him that hearty support in his conduct of our armies, which has given us victory, and him undying fame.

Heroes and great men differ from their fellow-men, by reason of the mission given them to represent the age and the wants of their people. The botanist teaches us, that all the forms of growth in the plant are first found in the leaf-bud. Branches, leaves, and flowers, first appear in this form. The plant may live and flourish, without the production of a single flower; but when it is designed that one should appear, *then* a leaf-bud, in no manner differing from other leaf-buds, begins to undergo changes that result in the production of the calyx and corolla, of stamens, pistils, and seed, containing within it the possibility of a new plant. In like manner, all the men of any particular age may be born with like faculties; but the special development of these faculties, in higher and more marvellous forms, is only granted to a few, who become the flower of the age—the representatives of its highest meaning. Men may die by thousands and hundreds of thousands, but the progress of the race is not checked. Leaves may be stripped from the tree, but its life is not destroyed. The tree draws its sustenance from the

fertility of the earth, and the human race has its roots fixed in the order of Providence.

What do we mean by Natural Science? Inasmuch as its discoveries, and its triumphs over natural difficulties are all found on the pages of history, the latter, in its widest sense, would include it. Still, it is necessary for us to fix some bounds to Natural Science, so that we may understand how the idea of an ever-present Providence is upheld by its records. It comprises a knowledge of the laws controlling matter in its different forms, and of the applications of these laws in natural or artificial processes. All that is material, whether it exist in the atmosphere, the bright-shining water, or the solid rock, is thus comprehended within its sphere. All that is cognizable by the senses, whether it be lifeless, inorganic matter, or that which is pervaded by the power of vitality, and subject to the influence of a reasoning, reflecting brain,—constitutes material for constant investigation in this department. Even the mere practical man, who only values that which will prove pecuniarily remunerative, sees how great are the advantages arising from its study; while he, who derives food for delight and wonder from a contemplation of the works of God, rises from the study of Natural Science with clearer and more distinct views of the power, wisdom, and goodness of the Creator. Outside of religion itself, this study furnishes the purest source of pleasure that can be furnished man, enabling him to find companionship all over the earth, whether his course be through the stormy waves of the ocean, the picturesque and fertile fields, the sands of the desert, or the craggy summits of the mountain. Nature is working every where, in accordance with laws that invite his examination,—is opening up secret labyrinths, wherein are concealed wonderful beauties, that he may enjoy, if he will but study out the paths that lead to them,—is throwing wide the portals of new palaces, to captivate the senses by the marvels that they contain.—All this, however, leads us to recognize *Natural Science*, like History, *as the way of God in the world*, although unlike it in its sphere of action, which is confined to mere matter and its laws, instead

of having to do with the actions and deeds of living souls. Here, as in History, we dare not consider the Deity as having established certain laws, and then suffered these to operate by themselves, while He watches their workings at an infinite distance. Nor do we more closely approximate the true idea, if we adopt the view that all evidences of power are but different manifestations of His actual presence, so that the sum of all that has ever been created is needed to give us the idea of God. The latter view leads to Pantheism, which is, after all, but a recognition of the Deity as a manifestation of power and beauty: while the former leads to Atheism, inasmuch as it forces us, by a species of logical necessity, to the conclusion that nothing more is required for the explanation of the mysteries of nature than that there should have been, from the very beginning, "*a law*," in accordance with which all nature has developed its beauties. But when we recognize the phenomena of nature as the result of laws, which are continually upheld and sustained by a divine Providence, then we seize the idea that underlies Natural Science as *the exhibitor of the ways of God in the material creation*, confined to time, established at its commencement, and doomed to end when the laws of the latter shall have accomplished the divine purpose.

If the view now advanced be correct, there should be a species of organic connection throughout the various departments of science, so that none could exist independent of the others, but all must inosculate, and intertwine, and mutually contribute to the support of each other. And the student finds this to be so in fact. He can investigate no one department of science, without calling in the aid of many others;—and such new facts or new laws as may have rewarded his patient care and labor are found to shed light upon the paths of all his fellow-laborers. While man, in his individual capacity, is comparatively nothing in the on-moving tide of history—a drop, as it were, in the great oceanic current of time,—so a single fact in science is only an atom in the constitution of a vast organism; but the man and the fact are not to be disregarded when they are considered as integral parts of the vast organisms with which they are con-

nected. They, along with others, make up these organisms, and are linked to them by indissoluble bonds. They could not be annihilated without leaving a *hiatus*, which would render humanity and nature, to a certain extent, imperfect. We may not be able always,—or rather, we should say, we are generally not able, to appreciate the nature of the loss that one man or one fact would produce, but nothing is truer than the poet's words:

> "From nature's chain, whatever link we strike,
> Tenth or ten thousandth, breaks the chain alike."

The beginnings of History and Science are always involved in obscurity. We receive them as they are borne along by the stream of tradition, which only bears the general spirit that marked their youth. And these traditions, to employ the words of an enthusiastic English writer, "are alternately simple in their grandeur, and profound in their complexity; now rising to the highest strains of poetry,—now again descending into the depths of philosophy. * * * Like a river whose waters are colored by the soil through which they pass; sometimes bright and sparkling in the sunshine, and so clear that the pebbles below are distinctly visible; and now turbid with the depositions of an alluvial soil." The historic record, when traced by the pen of inspiration, is silent concerning minor events. Tho sublime narrative of the progress of the work of creation, so simple and yet so grand as to furnish the strongest possible evidence as to the inspiration of the writer, omits unimportant details. No picture could possibly represent all these phenomena, and mere words could not make us understand how, from nothing, there sprang into existence the wonders of creation. The record furnishes a mere outline sketch. A few bold strokes of the pencil, and our spirits bow in awe and wonder before the result. "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." He says: "Let there be light," and "there was light." In the same wondrous way, by command of Omnipotence, the waters are gathered together, the greater and lesser lights are formed, living creatures are created, and man—male and female—is placed upon the earth to have dominion over it. That which is

important—the creation itself—stands out prominent, while the details are left unnoticed.

In like manner the early records of that form of History, which has been called profane, are also devoid of details, and from want of an inspired pen, have become enveloped with the gorgeous decorations of tradition. Before the discovery of letters, the deeds of heroes, the wisdom of philosophers, and the virtues of the good, were transmitted, from age to age, through the medium of song. The Bard was a personage sacred to his fellow men, and was looked up to with loving respect by the young, who had their souls attuned to noble deeds by the sounds that proceeded from his lyre. At first, doubtless, facts were faithfully reproduced in his verse, but partiality for his own people necessarily invested the verse with colorings that could not be considered literally true. It is the tendency of poetry to intensify the ruling spirit, whether good or bad, and hence, a species of hyperbole prevades the verse of antiquity that savors more of fiction than of stern truth. Still, on that account, we are not called upon to pass it lightly by, as it is comparatively easy to abstract the embellishment from the truth that underlies it. Homer, with all his gorgeous paraphernalia of gods and goddesses, of heroes with superhuman attributes and yet only men, of mysterious interpositions in the affairs of men from the heavens above, still gives us something that may be taken as real history although enveloped in the drapery of fable. There is deep truth involved in both his epics, illustrating what Rich says of the genius of the ancients, that "it was not simply a happy talent for seizing upon analogies and working them up into imaginary groups or historical figures, but it grasped the occult meaning of real history, and discovered in human actions the resemblance and effects of divine providence." And Lord Bacon recognized the Greek poets as so many witnesses to the existence of a purer religion before their day, and said that their fables were not to be received "as the product of the age, or invention of the poets, but as sacred relics, gentle whispers, and the breath of better times; that from the traditions of more ancient nations came, at length, into the flutes and trumpets of the Greeks."

It is easy to understand how embellishments would be added by the Bard to the facts contained in his verse, as he warmed up under the inspiriting influence of his subject and the enthusiasm of his youthful audience added fresh fuel to the poetic fire, already glowing in his breast. Each act of valor would be magnified, and each instance of self-denial so exalted, that faultless models would thus be furnished for the imitation of the age. When the spirit that animated a man or a past age could be made clear and present to the Bard's hearers, details ceased to have any special value. As the epic poet of his day, it was *his* mission to reproduce the *spirit* of the past,—and hence it was unimportant to narrate the trifling incidents of a hero's life, or the years of his birth and death. The stream of History has a natural tendency to free itself from all worthless drift-wood, as it courses along through mountain passes or darksome valleys, until at length it comes forth clear and bright and powerful.

The early days of History must necessarily be involved in obscurity. It is the case with the first beginnings of all organic life, whose very design is to develop that which will show its object and purpose,—moving, from the dark or obscure, onward to something clearer and more intelligible. It is a law of nature that the *punctum saliens* should be involved in impenetrable mystery. Under favoring influences, its development takes place, and there is formed the animal with its mysterious organs and complicated structure—all governed by laws that ensure the best possible adaption of the body to the purposes for which it was designed. The full formed animal presents fewer difficulties to the student of Natural History, than the microscopic cell in the egg which contains *potentially* the life of the whole animal. The circulation of the sap through the roots, trunk, branches, and leaves of an oak tree, with the wonderful results of that same circulation, are less difficult to understand than the fact that the *embryo* in the acorn will send forth, under suitable conditions, a plumule and radicle, which will in time, form a tree and its roots. Thus is it with History: its early days are enshrouded with mystery; it is only as its progress brings out the hidden meaning, that we begin to comprehend the same with the truth it embodies.

The only clear and distinct account of the early history of our race, that has come down to us, is found in the Old Testament; its clearness and distinctness are to be explained by the fact that it was furnished by inspiration. All other accounts are surrounded with fictitious wrappings. As an illustration of this, let us take the account of the Deluge given by Ovid. In the Iron age there was rapine wide-spread over the land; the guest was not safe from his host,—the father-in-law from his son-in-law; husband and wife stood in constant fear of each other; and Astræa—the goddess of innocence—last of all the gods had even deserted the earth—*Ultima cœlestum, terras Astræareliquit.* Jupiter, in full council of the gods, announces his determination to destroy the inhabitants of the earth and to people it with a new race. The waters are let loose from the heavens, and Jupiter empties the contents of his rivers over the land. A mighty deluge is the result, which covers the whole earth, save alone the top of Parnassus. Here Deucalion and Pyrrha—the sole survivors of their race—are found, and, when the waters have receded, they are the sole possessors of the earth. All this bears sufficient resemblance to the account of the deluge, contained in the book of Genesis, to enable us to uuderstand that *it* was the source from whence it was obtained. What, if the re-population of the earth, as detailed by Ovid, is altogether fabulous? It only sustains the statement already made with reference to the obscurity which attends the early days of History unillumined by inspiration. The poet indulges his fancy, and makes Deucalion and Pyrrha contribute to the re-population, by casting stones behind them which are metamorphosed into men and women.

> Inque brevi spatio, superorum numine, saxa
> Missa viri manibus faciem traxere virilem;
> Et de femineo reparata est femina jactu.

In a short time by divine powers the stones thrown by the man were made to assume manly forms, and those by the woman became women.

A brief glance at the history of the East will show us that nothing has been retained, except so much as may be necessary to make the great process intelligible, to make the mission of history, as the revelation of God's design in the world, clear. Prominent among the people, whose origin extends far back into antiquity, may be mentioned the Chinese. Their history is devoid of all that is interesting to the student, consisting simply of the names of dynasties that have held dominion over the land. Possessed of a certain amount of skill in the arts, they occupy a position in advance of their immediate neighbors, but seem to have acquired this ages ago, and to have made no progress since then. It is likely that the mariner's compass, gunpowder, and the art of printing, were known and used by the people of China long before any other people on the globe had learned their use. Their acquaintance with the manufacture of porcelain and silk goods, is also of great antiquity. We cannot tell whether these inventions and discoveries were improved upon by the Chinese, or whether their first acquaintance was as complete as their present ability to use them; although it is fair to conclude the latter was the case, as no improvement seems to have been made since we have known this people. The same patterns of porcelain, with an utter disregard for the rules of perspective, are made now that were made for our ancestors. The people seem, with ludicrous gravity, to follow the examples of their predecessors, endeavoring to tread in the same footsteps,—solemnly marching over the same ground, with a contempt for the rest of the world, upon which they look with supreme disdain. Confined thus to traditionary customs and usages, they have made no progress, and have contributed but little to the progress of humanity. In fact, their history is still in its infancy, since it is only when a nation begins to labor in heartfelt sympathy with the whole race, that its history becomes clear and well-defined.

Again, a similar obscurity clouds over the early and later history of India, although it is not as thick and impenetrable as that belonging to China. There is much evidence of cultivation: a religion containing some shreds and patches of truth;

a literature rich in curious mythological lore and true poetry; and remains of wonderful architectural skill. But faithless to its mission, India has fallen in the rear of the advancing columns of civilization, has yielded up its treasure to foreign invaders, and has become a mere appendage to the history of the English nation.

In Egypt the antiquarian detects indications of advanced civilization at a very early period, but the degrading effects of a religion given to the veneration and worship of animals as gods, the prevalence of the system of caste, and the tyranny of the priesthood, after a long struggle, gave the nation the downward tendency to destruction. It had contributed but little to the good of humanity, and, despite its obelisks, temples, and wonderful pyramids, occupies a small and insignificant place on the pages of history. Similarly, the Phœnecians —the prototypes of the modern Yankees—although they made the names of Tyre and Sidon as familiar as household words to the people of their age, have been stricken from the pages of history, because of their faithlessness to its grand design.

Indeed, there is strictly no such thing as history for any nation, unless it has been moving along in the front rank of the world's progress; losing this place, it loses its position on the historic page. While nearly the whole East was faithless to early traditions, received from their fathers, concerning the proper worship due to the true God, a little band in Palestine —devoted to His worship—carried on the main current of history; and all that we know of mankind for two thousand years is furnished from the records of this nation. Powerful dynasties have flourished around its people, but have disappeared without leaving a trace of their magnificence and power, while the Jews, because they always had some who refused "to bow the knee to Baal," have left a record rich in instruction and profit to the whole race.

We have thus shown that the beginnings of history are involved in obscurity, and that the career of nations which have been faithless to the advancement of humanity is not marked

on the page of history with any clear and distinct record. Let us, now, by way of showing the similarity of the two, glance at the obscure nature of the beginnings of Natural Science.

Probably no discovery has done more towards effecting a revolution in the arts than that of steam. It has diminished the manual labor required in the preparation of articles of necessity or luxury; has reduced the cost of the same, so as to bring them within the range of people of small means; and has produced results which would otherwise have been impossible. By way of illustrating, we may quote, from Ewbank, the statement that "the annual product of machinery in Great Britain would require the physical energies of one half the inhabitants of the globe, or, four hundred millions of men: and the various applications of steam in different parts of the world would now produce an amount of useful labor, which, if performed by manual strength, would require the incessant exertions of every human being." Steam has thus become a necessity in the present state of civilization—without which, the useful arts would be deprived of all their effective force; and its application as a motor power is now so simple, that the thoughtless may marvel why it was not so applied centuries ago.

The elasticity of steam was, doubtless, noticed in early times by persons engaged in culinary operations, but the idea of utilizing this property, of employing it for motor purposes required centuries before it assumed a practical shape. Who first employed the expansive force of steam for practical purposes is not known to modern investigators, although he may have lived at a very early period. At Pompeii, remains of cauldrons were detected by Sir William Gell, in the warm baths, which would seem to justify the opinion, from their construction, that steam had been employed in the elevation and distribution of the water through the baths. The Eolipile of Heron, whose peculiarity consisted in the revolution of a small hollow sphere, was one of the earliest machines on record, operated by steam. Vitruvius mentions Eolipiles as having been employed for the production of "vehement blasts," and several forms of this instrument were employed in 1548 as "fire-

blowers." In 1672, such an instrument is described as being employed in the fusion of metals and glass. In 1543, a vessel of two hundred tons is said to have been "propelled by steam in the harbor of Barcelona, and the fact is derived from the Archives of Simuncas, as deposited among papers in Catalonia." In 1615, De Caus applied steam as a means of raising water. But we cannot follow the notices of its employment which become more numerous as we approach the present era, some of which are here culled from those furnished by Ewbank in his treatise on Hydraulics. It is clear that the manifestation of the power of steam must have been as palpable to the first cook as to the most accomplished physicist of our own time, and yet the application of this power to practical purposes was not clearly apprehended by any mind until a comparatively recent date. Are we right in explaining this by saying, that mankind had not applied their reflective powers, until these latter days, with the view of discovering the mode of such application? Or, is not the position more tenable—that the time had not arrived for the necessity of such application, and that when that period was present, then the genius appeared with power to combine all the facts previously known and to construct the machinery that should make steam available for the uses of mankind? Is not the hand of Providence here seen, quite as well as in great historic events? When the necessities of man imperatively require the invention of a new motor power, then the inventor makes his appearance as the exponent and, at the same time, the satisfier of such wants.

The same conclusion is forced upon us by an examination of the history of Electricity. Two thousand years ago a philosopher of Miletus observed, that, when amber was rubbed, it acquired the property of attracting small bodies. Unable to explain the curious phenomenon, he attributed it to the soul of the amber, which went forth and drew foreign substances towards its home. This was the first fact in the science. Centuries rolled on, and fact after fact was slowly accumulated but submitted to no generalization. The world was not pre-

pared to use the wonderful powers of this agent. They had not learned the want of gilded or silvered vessels, and were satisfied to transmit all the messages demanded by courtesy or business by means of trusty horsemen. The process of Electro-plating, and the Electric Telegraph were not needed by the world, and had they been proposed, would have been discarded as useless. When, however, civilization had so extended its influences that both art and luxury required objects that should please the eye and gratify the sense of the beautiful, the electro-chemical art was discovered, and galvano-plasty offered its aid in the preparation of such objects at prices that would bring them within the reach of men in moderate circumstances. What would have been the value of this art to a savage tribe, content with the simplest form of culinary and other utensils, and the ornaments which nature supplied them? What appreciation could there have been of it in the days of Henry VIII. —the early portion of the sixteenth century? The world was not prepared for any such luxuries, and the art that produced them would have been of no value. And it is only in this nineteenth century, when the thirst for gain and the spirit of enterprise are found every where—when the demands of commerce and the fluctuations of governments have made communities constantly on the alert for novelties—when high cultivation of intellect and heart have made long absence from home and friends no longer tolerable, unless there should be some means of speedy communication with them—it is only in this busy, enterprizing, social age, that the electric telegraph can find a home. Time and space have become synonymes for wealth in the business world, as well as words of sad and dreary import frequently to those in social life. The slow-moving foot-traveller gave way to conveyances by horse-power; this, again, to the swift-moving steam-car; and this, again, to the more swiftly-flying electric current. The lightning of the heavens has become our messenger, and obeys with readiness the commands of man as its master, carries his messages from country to country, glides quietly under the deep waters, and binds countries together with a closeness that may be symbolical of

the coming of the glad time, when all shall join, in one great chorus, shouting forth the *gloria in excelsis*, proclaiming "peace on earth and good will towards men." Is the discovery and application of electricity, to such purposes, a mere chance event in the history of the world? Could it have taken place years ago? No! No!! No!!! A divine Providence is shown in the timeliness of this grand triumph of science, which, when the discovery was most needed, put it into the mind of man to produce it in "the fulness of its own time." Such must be the conclusion of every Christian mind having faith in History, faith in Science, and faith in the Providence of God.

From such a consideration of the nature of scientific discoveries, we do not learn reliance upon science or art in contradistinction to faith in the truths of religion as taught us by the Church catholic, but rather to place our trust in something greater than mere human ingenuity, something infinitely more powerful than human science. Says Sir Francis Palgrave on this subject, with an honest candor that well becomes a true scholar:—"All great inventions have, in their first impression, been independent of volition or of study, or of intellectual excellence. They have proceeded from sudden conceptions, descending, fully formed, as from the empyrean world of archetypal ideas, flashing upon the mind without previous investigation. Strangely, unexpectedly, unbidden like a dream, the irradiation excites surprise in the very individual to whom the thought has been imparted. * * * And the inventors, unassisted by the results of practice, or by the lights of education, display nought but the guidance of an unseen power." If the sparrows shall not fall to the ground without the knowledge of the great Father, could we expect less care from the same Being for those whom He has been pleased to create in His own image? Each invention of a world-wide importance must be looked upon as springing from the necessities of the race; and hence, as a species of revelation, as it were, to man of the power and goodness of God. They show us that humanity has such a relation to Deity, that it is always under His immediate supervision,—that no want can be really and truly felt by the former, but will be sa-

tisfied by the latter. Hence arises a deeper faith in History,—an assurance, in our inmost souls, that there never will be a want entitled to the name, which will not be provided for, either in the Present, or at some distant period in the Future.—Is not faith of this kind needed at the present day? We are not content with awaiting developments, which will show how present dissensions and bitterness can be settled. Each man has a plan that he believes to be the panacea required by the body-politic, and hence cultivates intolerance of the plans of his neighbors. The very number of these plans, the absence of the mighty mind to whose authority we should feel ourselves privileged to defer,—these show us that the time has not yet come for the final adjustment of our strife. Meanwhile each citizen must comport himself as becomes a true man, and, imitating the example of the late President in this respect, "with malice towards none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wound, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Before parting with our subject, it will be well to look upon the fact that, as the origin of history and science is obscure, and yet based upon truth, in like manner all old fables which have reached us, from the stores of the past, are necessarily based upon truth, and that all pseudo-sciences must contain some grains of pure gold, however much these may have been alloyed with baser material. It would not be possible for error to survive, did it not contain some truth. Truth as to the relation of God to man, was in the possession of the latter in the beginning. The restlessness of the race, the eager thirst for novelty that, in the opening of its career, led it to disobey law, and taste of the tree of knowledge,—urged it on to the invention of mysterious rites, and the worship of material representations of the unseen and eternal. Each phenomenon of nature was considered as under the control of some separate deity, entitled to reverential worship from his followers. The great

man, whom the wants of any particular age had produced, gradually lost all that he held in common with his race, as his name and deeds were handed down by tradition. His prominent characteristics were intensified by the lively imagination of posterity, until his memory was associated with the idea of a supposed divine power. All the aid that art could give was employed to surround his worship with paraphernalia which would attract, and at the same time overawe the senses. In this particular, the worship of the Jewish nation differed widely from that of its heathen contemporaries: the latter concealed the truth under meretricious adornments, that led the worshipper off from the sphere of symbolism to the adoration of the mere material representation. Yet it is plain to see that, beneath all this, there must have existed primal truths, which gave it a dignity sufficient to command the respect of the worshipper.

Mr. Rich has given us a summary of the defence of the Homeric mythology—the greatest and purest of all that had been produced by heathendom—as set forth by the philosopher Proclus. In Jupiter—the father of gods and man—"a monad was recognized, separate from the universe and the other deities, able to produce all things from, and again convert them to himself." As the idea of eternity could not be applied to any being by the ancients, Jupiter was considered as the descendant of the Chaos, through the Titans who claimed their origin from its children—Earth and Heaven. His abode was in the heavens—on the famed Olympus

> "The reputed seat
> Eternal of the gods, which never storms
> Disturb, rains drench, or snow invades, but calm
> The expanse and cloudless shines with purest day.
> There the inhabitants divine rejoice
> Forever."

The other gods were mere incarnations of different powers or forces of nature. Thus the god of the waters—the ruler of the storms—was placed in opposition to Apollo, the god of the sun; and a series of contrasts is shown in the battle of the gods, which furnishes, to the thoughtful student, a striking exhibit of the antagonistic character of some of the forces of

nature. So long as all these deities were worshipped with honest reverence, there was something left to the classic age, that elevated it high above the sensual condition of the world. But when the golden nucleus was rejected, and the dry husk became the sole food, then superstition of the vilest kind, associated with the lowest form of sensuality, seized the entire being of these people.

Many of the genii and other personages supposed to possess giant power, described in Oriental stories, were first taken from the pages of Jewish history—the truth itself having been so decorated, that it is now almost impossible to detect the same amidst its multitudinous coverings. Many of these have some reference to Solomon, the son of David, whose wisdom and fame were well known throughout the then civilized world, so that even the Queen of Sheba, attracted by his reputation, came to Jerusalem "to prove him with hard questions." The splendor of the reign of such a monarch, whose wealth and grandeur were unequalled in his day, whose learning surpassed that of the whole world, and who was the favorite of God himself, made others, beside the Queen of Sheba, seek Solomon "to hear his wisdom, which God had put in his heart." Such a man was soon invested with attributes beyond those peculiar to a human being, and the East taxed its inventive powers to the uttermost, to display the wonders that his wisdom had been able to produce. He was supposed to be clothed with power over demons and genii, so that the forces of nature were in subjection to him, and his seal all-powerful in the production of wonders. The pages of the Arabian Nights are filled with stories of all this, so that every one is more or less acquainted with the exaggerated accounts given by eastern romance of Solomon—all manifestly based upon the truth that he embodied all the wisdom and science of his age.

It would be impossible, in the short space allowed for an article, to examine many instances of this kind. The beginnings of mythology and fable, like those of all history, are based upon Truth, the only basis that will support any structure. They speak to us of days when a simple-hearted race strove to

refer all things to the influence of some higher power, and, in their ignorance, conceived the great man to be himself a god, instead of being the gift of God. They speak in truthful tones to those

> "Whose hearts are fresh and simple,
> Who have faith in God and Nature,
> Who believe, that in all ages
> Every human heart is human,
> That in even savage bosoms
> There are longings, yearnings, strivings
> For the good they comprehend not,
> That the feeble hands and helpless,
> Groping blindly in the darkness,
> Touch God's right hand in that darkness
> And are lifted up and strengthened."

All pseudo-sciences of the Past have also been based upon truth, and should not always be considered as sheer impostures, or their cultivators be classed as knaves. Some of them sprang into existence early in the history of the world, and then claimed a certain amount of respectful attention from the learned, as well as the unlearned. Astrology—from which arose the science of Astronomy—was the earliest known of these pseudo-sciences, and, for more than five thousand years, it has numbered some portion of mankind among its followers. The shepherds on the plains of Chaldæa first noticed the movements of the stars, learned to follow the planets in their changes, and the whole host of the fixed stars in their apparent motions around the earth. Their wonder was converted into an ardent desire to understand these grand phenomena;—and, along with such observations, came the idea that these changes were surely connected, in some way, with the fate of the human race. For a poetical people, the transition was readily made from loving admiration of those glorious works of the Creator's hand, to adoration and worship of them as mediators between the mighty Lord and His weak and feeble creatures. It was a source of unutterable awe to the soul of man—the thought that the great stars, with their bright rays of light, were connected in some mysterious way with his own destiny. The truths of nature were in this manner

employed to foretell future events, and Astrology was but another name for fortune-telling. In course of time the Creator, with some, was wholly neglected; while the stars were worshipped as gods, and the religion of the times degenerated into the worst form of Idolatry. Maimonides says this error arose even in the days of Enos, the son of Seth, and that it consisted in this: "That they said—Forasmuch as God hath created these stars and spheres to govern the world, and hath set them on high, and hath imparted honor unto them, and that they are ministers that minister before Him, it is meet that men should laud, and glorify, and give them honor. * * In process of time, the glorious and fearful Name was forgotten out of the mouth of all living, and out of their knowledge, and they acknowledged Him not. * * And the wise men, * * the priests, and such like, thought that there was no God, save the stars and the spheres, for whose sake, and in whose likeness, they made these images; but as for the Rock everlasting, there was no man that did acknowledge Him, or know Him, save a few persons in the world, as Enoch, Methusaleh, Noah, Shem, and Heber." This wicked form, which the study of the stars had assumed, was cast off as the stream of history approached our present era. Astronomy itself had led its followers, by one of its stars, to Bethlehem of Judea, where the dawn of Light and Life was then breaking upon a benighted world. Purified from all superstitious ornaments, it now holds forth attractions to the ambitious student and the devout Christian inferior to none of its sister sciences.

Alchemy, in part, arose from Astrology, but undertook even bolder tasks: it sought the means of indefinitely prolonging life, the gratification of man's avarice by the discovery of the philosopher's stone, and the preparation of a solvent which would liquify every substance with which it came in contact. Its ranks were filled with men of all professions; and prominent among these were the clergy of Europe, whose writings display a singular combination of deep reverence to God, and wild rant concerning powers, they claimed to possess, which, in their very essence, could only belong to Him. A child can now point out

their errors; but he has the clear light, that the science of the present throws over the mysterious processes of nature, to show him the right way. To understand alchemical writings, we must strive to attain the stand-point which was occupied by their authors,—and then we shall find that there are profound truths underlying their superstructures of error. From these truths has arisen a new science—Chemistry—first among those that have invested man with authority over Nature and her forces. The investigation of the composition of matter no longer leads man away from the source of all truth; and by means of the light which the latter furnishes him in his investigations, he becomes more useful to his race. Every art and science claims aid from Chemistry, and it furnishes the same as from an open treasury to all that ask for assistance.

It would be foreign to our design to select, from the records of Alchemy, all that has been preserved of truth and transferred to the pages of Chemistry. There were very many truths known to this pseudo-science. It was necessary that obscurity should precede light, although we know not for what reason. Night always precedes day. The *evening* and the morning constituted periods which Moses called days in the history of creation. When the time arrives for the morning-dawn, in accordance with laws, which are now pretty clear to us, the sun slowly makes its appearance above the eastern horizon. And, in the history of the world, when more light is to be shed on man's path, and darkness is to take its flight then the revelation of the so-called discovery or invention, is made to man, and light and heat and beauty animate what was dark and cold and repulsive. What matters it though we be ignorant of the laws that govern the appearance of such revelations; is it not meet and right to hail them with joy, and to be thankful for their appearance, rather than to weary our minds with the silly wish that they had appeared before? Aye! let us labor after a knowledge of God's works;—it is our privilege: let us search through the arcana of nature;—it is our birthright: let us appropriate to our use all that has been made known in the past;—it is our inheritance: but let all

this be done with lowly humility and grateful recognition of the fact, that "every good gift, and every perfect gift, is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

The true glory of any age, must consist in strict fidelity to its past history. We do not mean, that it should follow slavishly in the footsteps of its predecessors, but simply, that it should contribute, as much as may be in its power, to the normal development of its mission, as shown in the course of its history. Fidelity to duty is always grand; with a nation it is glorious.

There is but one absolute Truth, and all the forms of truth, which meet us in the history of mankind or in the paths of science, are rays that have proceeded from this great primal Truth. By faith and trust in Him, we prepare ourselves to rely upon the future of history, as well as the future of science. To evils of Governments and defects of science, we are not patiently to submit; but, while honestly and perseveringly striving to rid ourselves of these, we must be prepared to meet many disappointments. Governments and science are but means in the hands of the Deity, and shall we complain at His manner of using them?

With another consideration we close. Two systems of religious worship have occupied the attention of man; in that of the Jews, God was looked upon as a supreme and awe-inspiring Being, who only communicated to man through the terrors of His laws, and whose service consisted in sacrifices and other rites of a typical character; in that of the Greeks and the Romans, men endowed with extraordinary powers were invested with the attributes of gods. The Jewish religion aimed at bringing down the blessings of God to man through divinely appointed rites and ceremonies; the Greeks and Romans labored at a near approach to God by making one of their fellow-beings assume the attributes of Divinity. The Christian religion meets the desires of both, since it presents to us a God-man, so that Deity is brought down to us, while man is, at the same time, elevated to relations of brotherhood with one member of the Trinity. In this union of Deity with humanity, we

have the key to all history and all science. When all the world shall believe on Him, then the design of God in the world—which is history—will have been accomplished, and the laws of Nature—which constitute Natural Science—will have completed their task. The obscurity of their beginnings will sink into insignificance, as compared with the glories of their end; the seeds of truth that were first sown in them, will have produced an inflorescence that shall be glorious and perdurable.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

A TREATISE ON MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY; OR MERCERSBURG AND MODERN THEOLOGY COMPARED. *By Samuel Miller. Philadelphia*: S. R. FISHER, & Co., *Publishers.*

This little book of 131 pages is a brief statement in *popular* form of the salient points of Mercersburg Theology, in contrast with what the author styles Popular Theology. It is written for the people, as a contribution to our popular denominational literature, and does not aim to be an elaborate, scientific treatise. The writer also disclaims any intention of appearing as an authoritative exponent of Mercersburg Theology, but professes only to give his views of that theology, formed by his reading and study of the Mercersburg writings for the last twenty years. As such, the book has merit, and among those who have some acquaintance with the subject, it is doubtless calculated to do good. Many of the points stated by the author, are, we think, correct, though they are presented in so brief a form, that they would hardly convey a correct idea to those who have no acquaintance with the subject, especially as they are enumerated without regard to their connection in a system. Yet we here and there discover evidences of the writer's not having properly mastered the system which he attempts to expound. For instance, under the head of *The New Creation*, he represents man in his original creation as being fully and harmoniously united with God. "Man, at the head of the first creation, with all its different orders of life, with which he stood intimately and harmoniously connected, stood in the same intimate and harmonious relation with God, his Creator, and the paradise on earth with the paradise above. God and man were united, heaven and earth were in harmony." Mercersburg Theology teaches, we think, that man, in his original creation, was a *candidate* for the consummation of the union with God, but that he failed in the first step on his part towards attaining it. There can be no such harmony and union with God, without man's free obedience, not to speak of the original necessity of taking up human nature by the Logos in the person of the God-man. Hence, the author goes wrong again, we think, when he represents the new crea-

tion as called into being, merely to bridge over the chasm produced by sin. Mercersburg Theology finds a deeper ground than this for the new creation in Christ. Although new, yet it does not come in as an afterthought of God; an experiment merely to repair the ravages made by sin, but as that to which the whole natural creation, in its original constitution, looks for its completion.

We think the author has overstrained the argument, and involved the subject in confusion, in his chapters on faith and the evidences of Christianity. "According to Mercersburg Theology, faith is the apprehension of a *self-evident* truth, that requires no proof or authority beyond itself." This is a better definition of intuitive reason than of faith. It will be found, accordingly, that the writer makes no distinction between the two. He says, "Psychologically considered, faith is of the same nature, whether its object is the natural or the supernatural . . . what little we do know (in the proper sense of the word) we know by faith, because it is apprehended as self-evident by faith, whether it comprehends a natural or a supernatural truth, both of which have their ultimate ground in God." That "the whole is greater than the part" is an axiom, a self-evident, "continuous fact." The reason assents to this, and knows it to be true. Now the writer seems to make faith in the supernatural the same thing. But why then did not the first disciples, and all men universally give their assent to the truth of Christianity in the same way? He says the Bible authenticates itself as self-evident truth in like manner. But is this true? Were not the Apostles first of all inspired by the Holy Ghost, and was not this a part of the revelation made to them? And must we not make account of the inspiration of the Scriptures, the gift of the Holy Ghost, in order thus to apprehend the truths presented to us in Scripture? There is a basis, or capacity for faith in the supernatural in man, but unlike an intuitive idea, it requires to be met by a revelation from above, before it can go out in the form of Christian faith. "Whether the truth of any thing is susceptible of becoming absolutely certain to us, depends upon whether it is susceptible of becoming self-evident." But are we to thus "test," as he says, the truth of Christianity by our natural consciousness of its truth? Certainly not. The revelation made by God, always carries with it at the same time an inspiration, nay it is only in this form that a revelation can be really, inwardly made. Hence, the Heidelberg Catechism teaches that faith is worked in our hearts by the Holy Ghost.

We think, that on the subject of the Trinity there is some truth in his representations, but a good deal that must either come from his own fancy, or from somewhere outside of Mercersburg Theology. For instance, that man has a longing for God as Father, calling thus for the first person in the Trinity; for God as a brother, calling for the second, the Son; and for God in a union typified by the marriage relation, calling for the person and work of the Holy Ghost. Still further the writer states, that "*Modern* theology holds that the doctrine of the distinct personality of the Son of God can be established only by the

teachings of the Bible on evidences lying outside of Christianity." He thinks Mercersburg Theology gets at the doctrine in another way. Let us see what he says:—

"With regard to the distinct personality of the Father, there is no question among those who believe in a personal God. He is not only the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the natural and eternal Son of God, but he is unquestionably also our Father, by creation and adoption." (Is He *unquestionably* our Father, because we feel the need of a heavenly Father? or because He is the Father of our Lord? And is He more *unquestionably* the former, than the latter?) "As such He can never become any thing else to us! *He, our Father*, can never become *our Brother.*" (And yet there have been Patripassians.) "In order that *God* may become *our Brother*, there must of necessity be a natural and eternal *Son of God*, as a distinct person from the Father." That is, the fact that there is a second person in the Trinity, the Son of God, is rendered necessary by our want of a fraternal relation to God! And this is the way *we* get at the doctrine of the distinct personality of the Son of God!

Surely man has no such innate desire for fraternity with God. He has yearnings after an incarnation, but only because thus only can God and man come together. Christ became man's elder brother, not that this *fraternal* relation might be established, not this as the end, *but in order that by this, man might be brought into union with God.*

One still more fanciful idea closes the volume. There must be a trinity in the development of the Church—a Church of the Father, a Church of the Son, and a Church of the Holy Ghost. The first development of the Church was the Roman, corresponding to God the Father, a legalistic Church, &c.; the second development was the Lutheran Church, corresponding to God the Son; and the third development was the Reformed Church, that division of Protestantism which was not Lutheran, corresponding to God the Holy Ghost. The Church of the future is to combine these three, the Roman, Lutheran, and Reformed (the Greek Church must be left out in the cold), in one, as the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one!

Now, it would be curious to know where this ingenious fancy came from. We remember a curious and studied address once delivered before the Alumni Association of Marshall College, on *The Trinity in Man*, and we thought the writer might have found it there; but in recurring to the address we could not find it. Of course, he has a right to hold and advocate it; but in this book he is giving, not his own theology, but that of Mercersburg. We would like to know where and how he can get it legitimately from that theology. We shall add no more to this brief notice in the way of taking up special points

As far as the book here noticed serves to direct attention to the subject of which it treats, it will do good. Yet Mercersburg Theology seeks to work *with* all the better, Catholic, theology of the age, towards one common end. With all its imperfections, we commend the book to the public. We, no more than the author, wish to be understood

as an umpire in the case. We have only stated what we think Mercersburg Theology does or does not teach on the points referred to. A.

Lange's Commentaries, *Edited by Dr. P. Schaff.*

This great work, published by Charles Scribner, 654 Broadway, New York, makes rapid progress. In 1865 appeared the first volume, on the Gospel of St. Matthew, the original by Dr. Lange, and the translation, with numerous notes, by Dr. Schaff. This volume has already passed through a number of editions. Two more superb volumes have just left the press. Vol. II. includes St. Mark, by Dr. Lange, and St. Luke, by Dr. Van Oosterzee, and the translation of the first by Prof. Dr. Shedd, and the last by Dr. Schaff and Rev. Charles C. Starbuck. Vol. IV., on the Acts of the Apostles, by Drs. Lechler and Gerok, is translated by Prof. Dr. Charles F. Schaeffer. That on the Gospel of St. John, by Dr. Lange, the translation being in the hands of Dr. Edward D. Yeomans, is to come in as Vol. III., and will no doubt be shortly published.

The judgment of scholars and critics in regard to the merits of the original, as between Dr. Lange himself, and his different contributors, varies; but there is but one voice in regard to the general merits of the work, as a whole, so far as published. We admire the warm-hearted, vigorous, original, suggestive Lange, but scarcely less the calm, careful, clear Van Oosterzee. Both these men possess, besides solid and extensive scholarship, also genius and intuitive poetic natures.

In these commentaries their poetical spirit is made the bearer of the most enthusiastic and edifying piety. Gerok, who prepares the Homiletical part of the commentary on Acts, is also a poet of considerable note in Germany. Prof. Lechler had extensively studied and written on the Apostolic, and Post-Apostolic age, which proved to him the very best literary preparation for his commentary, and the selection of him, by Lange, for this part of the general work, has been regarded as the very best that could have been made.

Some have regretted that Dr. Lange did not undertake to go through with the whole work himself. This, however much as we admire Dr. Lange, we think undesirable, even if one man's life and strength were enough for such a herculean labor. A man of less general ability will accomplish more than another possessed of more when he makes a particular department a special study; and especially if he possess special qualifications for the particular department to which he devotes his studies. All our extensive commentaries, the work of one man, prove that no one man has sufficient scholarship, flexibility of mind, and richness of thought, to carry him successfully through the whole field of divine revelation. Some parts must be inadequately done, and old thoughts will ever recur in various forms. Let a man devote all his powers on one book of the Bible, and his commentary will have a richness which it would not be possible for him to give to all. For this reason we must highly approve of Dr. Lange's plan of assigning dif-

ferent books to special authors. This, we think, is the ground of the acknowledged superiority of this commentary to any that has ever appeared before.

What of the translations here presented to the American Church? Compare them with the stiff, and often incorrect translations which come to us from England! There are many of them which we could not understand at all, in many places, if we did not recognize the German behind the English. How those get along with them to whom the German is not familiar, we are not able to say. Translating the German word which means *translation* into English, with the same dictionary-bondage as those seem to labor under who render these works into English, would most correctly express what it is they do to them—they *overset* them! But read these American translations! We can give them no higher praise than to say, that it is difficult to discover from the English that the book ever existed in German. Dr. Shedd has translated other works from German, and has acquired a fine facility. Dr. Schaeffer is also an old hand at the work, and has no superior in the art. Of Mr. Starbuck's translation we cannot speak without some abatement of praise. His style is simple, but sometimes inelegant, and not always clear, nor altogether free from the German form of thought. We are, moreover, sorry to see that, under Luke iv. 1, he applies the impersonal pronoun *its* to the Holy Ghost, which is not only a deviation from the original, but also embodies a vital, though, we suppose in this case, an unconscious heresy. Also in the very next sentence he translates: "Full of the Holy Spirit, *that* now, more than ever, penetrated and inspired Him." With a few such like exceptions the work seems to be faithfully done. Dr. Schaff's part of the work extends over the first three chapters. It is done in his usually clear style, and furnished with more extensive notes than the remainder of the book.

We are sorry that as these volumes were received only a few days before this number of our Review was closed, we have not had time to give the whole work such a thorough examination as it deserves. However, it has been extensively noticed, and its general character, as well as its excellencies, are well known. We cannot too highly estimate the service which Dr. Schaff is performing for our American Christianity by bringing out this great work in the English language. It will silently, but steadily and powerfully work for the abatement of the theological vice of narrow, individualistic, unchurchly, and unsacramental renderings of Sacred Scripture in our pulpits, papers, and reviews. Its popularity is one of the pleasant and hopeful signs of the times. We hope the remainder of the work may speedily appear. Mr. Scribner spares no expense in getting out these splendid volumes. Each contains between four and five hundred pages of royal octavo; and, in its compact pages, double column, every corner made solid by notes in smaller type, is contained a richness of matter which might, by a little art, have been distributed over two or three volumes of the same size. We wish the work abundant success.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

APRIL, 1867.

Art. I.—THE CHRISTIAN IDEA OF ALMSGIVING.

Men, who find it more easy and convenient to float on in the current of their own second-hand traditions, than to take earnest hold of primal questions pertaining to the Christian faith and life, have not ceased, by covert insinuation as well as by direct assertion, to charge that the peculiar theology set forth and defended in this Review is concerned mainly with abstract speculations. No charge could be more untrue. It is the most solemn practical interests of Christianity that we are seeking to conserve and promote. But in doing so, we aim to call back the Christian mind from the vain wanderings, into which it has been, unconsciously we may admit, but still really, drawn, to re-present and emphasize those original Christian principles, which have been forgotten and left behind, and thus to bring the Christian life again into living union with its original and unchanging dogmas. This we claim as both the merit and the mission of our theology.

A single remark will verify the justness of what has just been said. Its truth and force has been felt for years in the Church, to whose interests this Review is more directly devoted, in regard to the general subject indicated by the caption of the present article. The attention of the Church has been called to the subject, from time to time, both in its periodicals and by synodical action. But the propositions made, and the

remedies suggested, struck the mind of the Church as new and strange, not because they are not founded in the word of God or known in the divine science of the Church, but simply because they had been gradually and effectually excluded from popular faith and practice. Just so far, however, as the Church has been invigorated by the power of a better theology, has its mind and heart opened to better views on this subject; and it has now actually begun to look at the whole matter with other eyes, and is prepared to hear on this truly practical question as never before. The living connection between our theology and this particular sphere of practical Christian life, begins to be seen and felt with ever-increasing clearness. The real humanity of Christ—the vital union of His divine-human life with human life in all its spheres—the consecration of all things in Him, in the Church—the true idea of worship, which calls for the offering of all, soul, body, property, and life, upon the altar, and the acceptableness of all this as true devotion, and a sacrifice well pleasing to God—these primal dogmas have reached the hearts of the people and verified to them their practical power, so that what has been flippantly denounced as vain theories and dangerous speculations, they begin more and more to recognize as the old, true, anointed wisdom of God. This, therefore, is a living subject before us at this time. We propose to discuss it earnestly.

We know what is involved in meeting the popular views and practices on this subject. We know how an attempt to arraign the present prevailing scheme and mode of general benevolence will be met by an array of so-called facts. We know how men will direct us to the princely gifts, which are almost weekly made to various institutions, and to the columns of acknowledgments in our religious journals, of contributions to every variety of charitable objects, all of which, it is held, goes to designate this as the most golden age of benevolence which the world has ever witnessed. Were the value and force of alms to be measured by their amount in dollars, we should yield at once to this formidable logic; but when we read that a man may not merely give half a million out of his five millions, but

may even give "*all his goods*," and yet "*not have charity*," we must still conclude that giving money and doing true alms, are not one and the same thing.

What are alms? The original sense of the word beautifully includes both the *gift* bestowed and the *spirit* which prompts it. The gift is not an alms, unless pity and compassion are united with it.

The variety of spirit or feeling which may prompt giving, has furnished occasion for the creation of a variety of words to designate its various phases. This is the case, more or less, in all languages; and a glance at these will help us to get at the true Christian idea. The English will serve our purpose, by way of illustration.

We call a man, disposed to give, "generous." This word we have from the Latin *generosus*, and this from *genus*, including those born of the same race, family or stock. A generous man was originally a noble-born, and hence regarded as noble-minded, noble-hearted, magnanimous, able and disposed to help others of his kind, or of the same *genus*, who might be in need. Generosity, then, is a natural prompting of one more fortunately circumstanced by his birth, toward one of his kin more humbly born, and hence needy and dependent. It is a virtue having its basis wholly in the natural relations of human life.

We have the "liberal" man. This word comes to us from the Latin *liberalis*, one free-born, as over against a slave. Hence, a man, who has means without having been under the necessity of painfully acquiring them, so that he does not value them, and is free to give to others because he has no cause or object to keep them closely for himself, is a liberal man. The word means a little less than profuse or extravagant. A liberal man is one who gives because he does not value money, and does not inquire particularly in regard to any responsibility in the case, nor is particularly concerned as to what end it will serve after it leaves his own hands. That the word *libertine* should be related to this same word is sufficient to show, that it bears no distinctively Christian idea.

The words "benevolent" and "beneficent," the first designating the *disposition*, and the second the *act* of doing good, though of a higher character than the above, do not, in themselves, represent truly Christian ideas. Hence, they are both applied to acts of mere natural men, and to acts prompted by no gracious disposition.

The word "philanthropy," from φιλος and ανθροπος, like "generous," designates an act of good-will, prompted by the relation in kin, only it is more comprehensive, taking in the whole race of man. It designates purely a love of man to man, because he is a fellow-man. The idea it embodies lies purely in nature, and is the same in character, only higher in kind, as that mutual sympathy, which one animal manifests for another in distress. The love of man, as man, and because he is man, designated by this word, is the highest the heathen mind could ever reach, and hence, this is the highest and best word the heathen world possesses.

When, however, we now pass over into the purely Christian sphere, we have a word, the use of which occurs in no heathen writer, ἀγάπη, in the New Testament translated "charity." The coming in of a new, heavenly idea, required the forming of a new word to embody the supernatural sense. So high is this above all that mere nature may attain in its own sphere, that it is possible for a man to be generous, liberal, benevolent, beneficent, philanthropic to such a degree, as to "give all his goods to feed the poor," and yet not have this ἀγάπη—charity. This charity is itself a grace, a gift, from God. It is something which man has not naturally, nor can from himself develop, or of himself acquire, but which he must receive. It comes from above to him and unto him. It is that love and good-will toward men, which is the effect of the love of God in the heart. It does not, like philanthrophy, love man for man's sake, but it loves man for God's sake. It is a love that is active toward man, in and from its divine source. It is in view of this high origin, that it is always distinguished, in the old Collects, as that "celestial charity," that "divine charity," that "most excellent gift of charity," without which, "all our doings are

nothing worth," the "very bond of perfectness, and of all virtues."

The same high sense is represented by the word alms in the New Testament. Hence, the disposition which prompts almsgiving is, by our Saviour, required to have a true inward reference to the "Father who seeth in secret;" and the alms of Cornelius are directly connected with his inward state, as the act of "a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, and prayed to God always."

The words alms and charity are, at present, in popular language, restricted, for the most part, to gifts for the relief of the poor, in the way of providing for their temporal and bodily needs. In their full Scripture sense, however, while they include this, they are of wider signification. In the Old Testament, the gifts offered were used to make provision for all classes of needy men. The priests themselves were supplied from them, and all the requirements of the religious service were provided for out of them. They were gifts to God for *all* the needs of His service and people. In the New Testament, the use of alms has the same wide range. Alms were needed, not only to provide the poor with food and clothing, but also to keep missionaries on their way; and even St. Paul acknowledges, that the Philippian Church "sent once and again unto his necessities." So whatever was needed in this way in the general operations of the Church, was supplied by the charities of Christians. In like manner, through all the history of the Christian Church, alms are properly all the offerings of Christians to the Church for all its needs; and it is in this comprehensive sense that we use the word.

What, now, is the true Christian idea of almsgiving? From what we have said of the true Christian sense, which underlies the words charity and almsgiving, it will at once be seen that it is:

First of all, an act of religious devotion. It is not, primarily and mainly, an act, the aim and intent of which is to make provision for existing and pressing needs. This, of course, it is

designed also to effect. But this is not the ground or motive, out of which the act springs. It is not the scene of poverty and misery, upon which the heart is fixed, and by which it is moved, but the will and love of God in the heart, that is the source of alms-doing. It is this exactly, which distinguishes it from philanthropy, of which the merely natural man is capable. This last is an act directly between man and man, while the other is an act toward God, and through and from God to man. It is, in one word, first an act of worship to God, prompted by His grace, and only after having been so offered, does it become true charity to man.

That almsgiving is strictly and truly an act of religious worship, is at once evident from our Saviour's words in the sixth chapter of the gospel according to St. Matthew. Alms, prayers, and fasting are by Him put in exactly the same category. The same spiritual inward disposition is required in one as in the other. There is to be in each and all the same absence of ostentation, the same modesty and humility; the same hearty sincerity; and the same reward is promised to each of these acts. So that if prayer and fasting are acts of worship, so is doing alms. In another place, our Saviour, while He reproves the zeal of the Pharisees for outward cleansing, enjoins rather the giving of alms, as the true inward consecration by which all things become clean unto them. (Luke xi. 41.) In the case of Cornelius, alms and prayers are put in the same category as acts of devotion, and as alike held in remembrance before God. These passages show that alms, as acts of devotion, are acceptable acts of worship in the sight of God, to be rewarded in precisely the same way, and in the same sense, as prayers, or any other acts of worship.

Let us see how this same element entered into the constitution of the Apostolic Church. In the nature of the case, we may expect to find it rather *assumed* and *underlying* the whole order of doctrine and cultus, than formally introduced and set forth. It lay in the very life of Christianity, like other fundamentals—as, for instance, the existence of God, the Trinity, the Divinity of the Son and Spirit, the right of infant member-

ship of the Church, and others—and, being thus pre-supposed and assumed, we may expect to find it appear only in the way of familiar allusion. But this incidental appearance of this fundamental element, only serves the more strongly to show, how radical a factor it is in the original apostolic doctrine and cultus.

Exactly in the way now represented, does it actually lie in the Apostolic writings. Let us give a few instances. In a record we have of the first Christian congregation and church at Jerusalem, we read that their cultus embodied four elements. The three thousand, who had been baptized and added to the Church, "continued in the Apostles' *doctrine* and *fellowship* (*κοινωνία*), and in *breaking of bread*, and in *prayers*." (Acts ii. 42.) The exposition of this passage, in connection with similar passages in other apostolic writings, where the word "*fellowship*" *κοινωνία* occurs, as given by Löhe, is so just, clear, and convincing, that we can do no better than translate from him.* "Simple and plain as these words (above quoted), may appear to a superficial view, yet do they furnish much matter for most careful study when more closely examined. It is, namely, the word *κοινωνία* which deserves notice. Κοινωνία means communion. But now, as the doctrine and the breaking of bread themselves already form a union and communion in the divine gifts, and the steadfastly striving after God and divine benefits is included in prayer, it is customary to refer the *κοινωνία* to the communion in the social Christian life; and some are inclined to understand it to mean all communion, which is indicated by the words doctrine, breaking of bread, and prayers—accordingly, every fellowship of love which manifests itself in life. Nor will we deny the correctness of this conception of the passage. At the same time, there is found in the holy Scripture still another application of the word *κοινωνία*, which gives point to the common view and sheds light on the passage.

"Only a few words farther on, in verse 44, occurs the adjective *κοινὸς* (common), in a sense closely connected with verse

* Aphorismen über die neuteſtamentlichen Aemter und ihr Verhältniß zur Gemeinde. Zur Verfaſſungsfrage der Kirche. Von Wilhelm Löhe. Nüremberg 1849. pp. 80—83.

42. 'All that believed,' we are told, 'were together, and had all things *common* (*κοινά*) and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need.' Thus the 'continuing in fellowship' went so far that no one said that aught of the things which he possessed were his own, but they had all things common—as this is repeatedly explained iv. 32 et seq.), and illustrated by examples (iv. 33 et seq.).

"Here we have to do with the words *κοινὸς*, *κοινωνία*, *κοινωνεῖν*. And we here see, first of all, that the word *κοινὸς*, and on account of the connection with verse 42, also *κοινωνία*, is used in relation to the community of love in earthly goods. Then in Rom. xii. 13, the verb *κοινωνεῖν* meets us again. The Apostle tells us what belongs to the saints, and among other things says: Ταῖς *χρείαις τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες*: 'Distributing to the necessity of saints;' or, 'communicate to the needs of the saints,' 'make what is yours common.' Here, we have plainly the same communion in earthly things mentioned in the passages above referred to. The saints are to make the needs of the saints their own, and seek to relieve them by communion in temporal goods. How far this use in language was extended, we also see, expecially in Rom. xv. 26, where we read: Εὐδόκησαν Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαία *κοινωνίον τινὰ ποιήσασθαι εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν* Ἱερουσαλήμ. 'They of Macedonia and Achaia have willingly *laid together a common contribution for the poor saints* at Jerusalem.' Here already *κοινωνία* is not any more the mere act of communicating; but, like our word *collection*, it unites with the conception of the act of giving that of the gift itself. An application of the word running altogether parallel is found in the passage immediately succeeding, verse 27. 'It hath pleased them verily; and their debtors they are. For if the Gentiles *have been made partakers of their spiritual things* (Εἰ *γὰρ τοὶς πνευματίκοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινώνησαν τὰ ἔθνη*), their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things.'

"Altogether of the same character with the passages now referred to are also those, which we find in the excellent addresses of St. Paul in regard to the collections ordered for the poor Jew-

ish Christians in Judea (2 Cor. viii. 4; ix. 13). It is not necessary here farther to explain these passages. What has been said is sufficient to establish, that Acts ii. 42 relates chiefly to communion of love in temporal things; but it will also illustrate, that the communion of love generally, *manifested* itself through a cheerful offering up of earthly goods for the benefit of the brethren. Viewing in connection the whole Christian life of the first congregation, we can safely say: Here is the origin of the oblations associated with divine worship, the origin of the *churchly* mercy and care for the poor, from which the holy institution of the Diaconate is originated.

"True, in Acts ii. 44, 45, it is not fully clear, that it refers to a giving in connection with worship; it appears as if the merciful had themselves distributed their gifts of love. But in Acts iv. 32, et seq., and v. 1, et seq., we find that all gifts were laid at the feet of the Apostles—and all receives the most decidedly spiritual character. At the disposal of the Presbyterium they placed their gifts—and where else than in connection with divine worship, where they also attended upon and enjoyed the Apostles' doctrine, the breaking of bread, and the prayers (ii. 24)? Out of this churchly giving and sacrificial offering grew the occasion for the sacred office of Deacon, or ministry to the poor. The *κοινωνία*, or fellowship, or communion of which we speak, is one of the most glorious New Testament ideas, one which is often brought forward by St. Paul with enthusiasm; and as *κοινωνία* is used in the sense of communicating or giving of every kind, from spiritual communications to the bodily ministry provided for by the collections, so we find, in perfect accordance with all this, that the conception of *διακονία*, or diaconate, comprehends also the service of the holy office down to the bearing of a collection, yea to the conception of the collection itself. To see this, we need only compare Acts xi. 29; xii. 25; Rom. xii. 7; xv. 25."

This truly earnest exposition places the matter in hand in the clearest light. It proves to the satisfaction of every reflecting mind, that almsgiving was, in the apostolic Church, yea at the very founding of it, a real and true part of Christian worship;

that these offerings were made to the Church, and by its proper ministry administered to every kind of need. Thus the worshipper brought to the altar of worship, not merely the fruit of his lips in prayer, but also the offering of temporal goods, that thus there might be in the bosom of the Church, not merely spiritual resources of grace for the souls of all the spiritually needy, but also temporal mercies for the earthly and bodily wants of all, who came within reach of her warm heart and merciful hands. To what a high and holy character was Christian almsgiving, thus raised!

Now it is precisely this primal feature of Christian almsgiving, that is at present almost wholly lost sight of, and even theoretically and practically excluded as a dangerous heresy. It is enjoined, it is true, as a *duty*, but not as an act of worship. On the contrary, Christians are warned against believing that it is an act of worship, and especially that it brings a reward of grace the same as prayer. It is in fact sundered from worship, and treated as a pure secularity. In many congregations the offering of alms as part of the service is entirely dispensed with, and this on the ground that the "collection," as it is called, comes in gratingly as a secularity in the midst of the worship! Even where it is continued, it is only on the ground that it is an ugly necessity—a kind of tolerable evil—in order that there may be funds on hand to defray the incidental expenses of the congregation in the way of light, fuel, and sexton's wages! while it is felt, at the same time, to be an interruption of the service not to be desired, but only to be endured, on account of the end it subserves. No one regards it as a part of the service; no one gives as an act of worship; no one regards it as an offering to God, but only as a help to the congregation. Then, also, in the case of "special collections," "special efforts," the aim is to procure the money needed. The object held up is the "needs of the cause." There is no hesitation in using *any* motives that will but subserve the end of bringing out the money. Even mutual banters and challenges to give certain sums are freely made, and not only regarded in order, but as an excellent way of bringing out the desired sums by a kind of public rivalry. We need

only to translate this *modus operandi* into the co-ordinate sphere of worship, that of prayer, and imagine Christians as mutually challenging each other to make prayers of a certain length, in order to see the terrible profanity of the procedure.

Even still farther than this is the sacred devotional act of almsgiving removed from its true ground as an act of worship, when it is brought out on the common secular and worldly level of games, fairs, lotteries, and rival auction contests. The very last paper we have picked up affords the following graphic illustration:

"At a Catholic fair in Memphis, Tenn., a cane was offered for the most popular county official. It was voted to Sheriff Winters. The votes cost one dollar each, and forty thousand eight hundred and thirty-six votes were cast. The cane originally cost eighty-five dollars."

"The end sanctifies the means!"—forty thousand eight hundred and thirty-six dollars is a good price for a religious cane; and if it be true, that the end sanctifies the means, then this cane and the popular sheriff have greatly served the glory of God! But Protestants, whilst they condemn the motto, are not a whit behind in adopting the measure. "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth;" and happy, also, we may see, is he who condemneth not others for that which he practises himself. Certainly, if we make the need sanctify the charity, we ought not to cast the first stone at the Jesuits.

This divorce of alms from worship is certainly a clear and monstrous defection, and one of the most wide-spread and ruinous practical heresies of the times.

If almsgiving is thus an act of devotion to God, it is plain, that it ought to be offered to God in and through the Church, and thus form a part of the order of worship. The sense of all ages has connected alms with the sanctuary. It was the treasury *in the Temple*, into which Jesus saw the poor widow, out of her poverty, in contrast with the scanty alms to the rich, cast in "all her living that she had," "unto the offerings of God." Hence, also, we have the incidental fact recorded by St. Luke

in the Acts of the Apostles, that the man lame from his mother's womb "was laid daily *at the gate of the temple*, which is called Beautiful, to ask alms of them that entered into the temple." When, in the first period of the apostolic Church, the believers, with such holy enthusiasm, sold their possessions, they "brought the price of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet," and then, as from the hands of the Church, "distribution was made unto every man according as he had need." (Acts iv. 35.) When St. Paul, in his order to the church at Corinth in regard to the collection for the saints directs them to attend to this thing "on the first day of the week (Sunday)," it is clearly implied that the offering should be made in connection with the church service on that sacred day; and he says that he has given the same order "to the churches of Galatia." (1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2.) If there were any doubts as to these offerings having been made in and to the Church, they are at once and fully set aside by the fact, that the Diaconate was instituted by the Church to be the ministry of these offerings to the needy. (Acts vi.) As an act of worship thus offered in connection with the Church, almsgiving partook of the nature and character of a sacrifice, which, offered at the altar, was acceptable to God, and brought grace to the one thus worshipping God by his offering. This is plainly asserted: "To do good, and communicate, forget not: for with such *sacrifices* God is well pleased." (Heb. xiii. 16.) St. Paul calls it a grace, and says that, in abounding in it, they first offered themselves unto the Lord, and thus, with themselves, their offerings of love; and in various ways through the whole passage, he lays stress on the spirit in which the offering was made. (2 Cor. viii.)

The same idea of almsgiving as an offering to God in the Church, is contained in the post-apostolic Church. "The gifts are throughout viewed as sacrifices, and the ministry to the poor constitutes, accordingly, a great, common, sacrificial act of the congregation; and the needy, according to this view, are regarded as nothing less than the congregation's altar of sacrifice." (See *Constit. Apost.* ii. 26; iii. 6, 7, 14; iv. 3.) With this is to be

compared the passage in Justinian, where, in regard to the offering of gifts, he insists, on the one hand, first of all, on willingness on the part of the giver; and, on the other hand, refers to the union of this offering with the holy Eucharist. What a purifying and quickening power this view exerted upon the offering of gifts, is especially to be deduced from two circumstances: first, in so far as the poor, as being the altar for this kind of sacrifice, expected that the gifts would be brought to them; and then, also, the fact that the gifts, which were not brought with a good conscience, were rejected as impure and displeasing to God, because it is better to die of want than to receive sacrificial offerings of *πονηροῖς*. A farther good which resulted from this view of almsgiving, is in the fact, that the idea and consciousness of the communion-character of all Christian offerings was in this way more fully developed and established."*

Is not this whole idea now lost, and the beautiful power of it eliminated from the consciousness of the Church and from Christian minds? Is it not true that prevailingly benevolence, instead of being performed as an act of worship, has become a matter of mere cool, calculating duty, or else of ostentatious challenge and rivalry; instead of a regular, habitual, devout offering to God, it is a fruit of occasional, spasmodic impulse, under outward pressure; instead of being presented in silent devotion at the altar of the Church, like prayer and praise, as our Saviour commands, without the left hand knowing what the right hand doeth, the whole arrangement is such as constantly to betray the feeling, that its success depends upon the extent to which it is "seen of men." Instead of individual alms, like individual prayers, being hidden in the body of the congregation and its worship, that they may first of all be to the honor of Christ in His Church, and then come forth from it as a genial ministering power, and thus be at once held "in remembrance in the sight of God," embalmed in the worship which is offered with them, and also go accompanied with those same prayers on their mission of mercy and love, they are given in a kind of out-

* Baumgarten in Herzog's Encyk., vol. i. p. 512.

side way, take an outside course, and receive an outside record before the eyes of the public in the newspaper list of acknowledgments. Moreover, they are not given to the Church as *one general offering* for all the needs of the Church, but particularized and divided to special objects, either by the particular preference of the donor, or by the circumstance of the special occasion which calls them out. Thus the individual preferences and partialities of the donor come in perpetually to neutralize and destroy the unity of the offering of the Church as a whole, which in this, as in all its worship, seeks to realize the grand idea of the communion of saints.

This whole practice and tendency has its roots in that vicious individualism and separatism which depreciates the Church as the body of Christ, and proposes, in an isolated way, with Bible in hand, to offer its own worship, and to work out its own redemption, by its own separate works and worship. This, as we well know, strikes at the root of the Church; and, so far as its influence goes, disparages its honor, and does away with its gracious mediation. In reference to our Saviour's sublime teaching on this subject of almsgiving in Matt. vi., Dr. Lange justly says: "Spiritual religion has, indeed, its outward and becoming expression,—chiefly, however, in the meek and devout worship of the Church, where the piety of individual believers is lost to outward view. The *worship of the Church* is, so to speak, the shadow in which the humility and meekness of the individual worshipper finds shelter and protection. * * * Let beneficence remain a secret of our right hand—a shame-faced and holy affection—an act of genuine piety, from which we immediately pass without self-complacency." Just and timely words, the true import of which can only be realized, as regards almsgiving when the true idea of this grace as an act of worship is restored to the Christian consciousness, and when almsgiving shall again be brought back into its true and living connection with the Church and its altar.

How has the Church been betrayed into this serious defection? When we contemplate the great gulf existing between

the present practise, and the true, original Christian idea of almsgiving, we may at once be convinced, that the evil has not come in by sudden revolution. It has been of slow growth, the seeds of it having been planted while men slept.

The defection began with the suppression of the apostolically instituted office of the Diaconate, or rather its absorption into the office of the Bishop, as this gradually came to be established in that new, peculiar sense, with which it began to be clothed in the Roman at an early period, and also later in the Anglican communion. The apostolical and Scriptural idea of these alms, as offerings and acts of worship in connection with the sacrificial functions of the Church, and the corresponding view that their use and distribution belongs to the Church as a part of its honor and ministry of mercy, was gradually so narrowed and emphasized as to develop the idea that the Bishop was the only proper holder and steward of the Church-alms, that he only fully knew the needy, and that as the chief steward in God's house, he was responsible to God alone in the distribution of this sacred fund.* The Apostles instituted the office of Deacons for the very reason, as they say, that "It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables," (Acts vi. 2); but now this office is set aside, and its functions absorbed in another, to which they do not belong, and by which it was found, by the Apostles themselves, it could not be properly administered. This, as may easily be seen, at once seriously interfered with this merciful ministry of the Church, and so also naturally with the offerings by which, according to the divine order, the Church was to be furnished with the means required for its healthy activities.

The next step away from the original idea of Christian almsgiving, was effected when Christianity became formally united with the State. "With the elevation (?) of Christianity to the position of a religion of the State, the original simple character

---

* See Herzog's Encyk., vol. i. p. 513, where Baumgarten also refers to *Hoefling's Lehre vom Opfer*, in which this latter author produces the authorities by which this fact is established. Pp. 27, 28, 52, 53, 229.

of the ministry to the poor vanished." So says Schutz, as quoted by Baumgarten. The latter adds: "The dark side of the state-Church consists in this, that it can no longer keep its hold on the original ground of the spiritual being—the will and the conscience of the individual personality,—because it externalizes the conception of the Christian element, and not only transfers it over to the mass of the people, but also to the territory of the State." The State soon began to require and regulate by law contributions required by the needy, and thus forced to be paid to the officers of the State as tax, what ought to be presented at the altar of the Lord as an act of gratitude to God in devout worship. What should only have been the pleasant privilege of the Christian, now becomes the stern duty of the citizen. Thus changed into the character of a compulsory tax, this necessary giving was not only removed from the altar of the Lord, but violence was done to the very spirit and disposition of which Christian alms can alone be the fruit.

Then came in the Roman heirarchy, which, adopting from the State Church the territorial division of clerical authority and supervision, demanded the tenth for the use of the Church. By this arrangement, though this tenth was given to the Church, and by the Church administered, it was still a regulated and imperative tax, and thus removed out of the free and truly Christian sphere of almsgiving. In addition to this, the hierarchy made room for the introduction of a sad corrupting element, especially in the relation of almsgiving to poverty, "by according to voluntary poverty a spiritual character, and thus not only legalized begging, against which the tender feeling of the early Church had so decidedly expressed itself, but also, in so far as hypocrisy got control of this kind of spiritual poverty, rooted out of Christian minds that reverence for true poverty which the pure spirit of Christianity cultivates."

The life of the Reformation at first delivered itself, in some degree, from this defection, and manifested, for a time, something of the holy enthusiasm of the apostolic and early Church, especially in regard to the needs of the poor. To some extent, the Lutheran Church, but still more the Reformed, by its more

complete congregational organization, and the restoration of the Deacon office, gave good promise of bringing the Scriptural views on this subject again into honor and full effect. But the full freedom of the reformatory life was not a little embarrassed by union with the State; and while the Deacon office was continued with considerable uniformity in the continental Reformed Churches, it never came to general introduction in the Lutheran Church; and, in the Reformed Church of England, taking the Episcopal form, the Diaconate was made a grade of the clerical office, so as not to have at all the same meaning and force as that given to it in its original apostolic creation. Thus, the Reformation Church in general, so far as this interest is concerned, fell gradually back again into the arms and under the power of the State, where it still remains.

How the interests of Christianity, and with it the honor and efficiency of the Church, as well as the true spirit of charity in the people, suffered by this defection, may be seen from a view of the misery and confusion into which the ministry to the poor has been thrown in all European countries, both Protestant and Roman, by the abrogation and loss of the true Christian element of almsgiving, as part of the cultus and concern of the Church, and allowing the whole interest to pass over into the hands of the State. Beggary is known to be the curse of all Roman Catholic countries. In France, in the year 1659, the beggars excited eight armed riots, which had to be put down by force. In Rome, alone, there are said to be from fifty to seventy-five thousand beggars! In Protestant European countries, Christian congregations have ever, to some extent, endeavored to complement what the State has left undone; but it is found that the whole system, or, rather, the absence of the true Christian system, is everywhere abnormal and inefficient in its operations; that its effects work injuriously in regard to all the interests involved, the State, the people who are made to contribute, the Church, and the needy.

In regard to the ministry to the poor, who in their claims on the alms of the Church we have always with us, experience has

abundantly proved that the State is wholly inadequate to the sacred work. It has not the tenderness necessary. Though it can compel the funds, it cannot bring to the poor the life, the grace, the cheer of the Church. It can only do its work with mechanical routine, in the cool spirit of the military drill, or the official precision of a State Bureau, where personal sympathies and Christian ministers are out of the question. Then, it is found that more money is needed to keep in operation the official machinery, than is used to provide for the natural needs of the poor. Let England be taken as a fair sample of this kind of State ministry. Under the Central Commission for the care of the poor, there are 590 secretaries, 415 chaplains, 2,256 superintendents, 1,238 overseers of workshops, male and female, 284 male and 483 female teachers, 346 directors in institutions, 171 nurses and waiters, 20 overseers of work, 444 receivers of poor money, 200 miscellaneous employees. In all, 9,283! What an army of officials living, in great part, on what the poor ought to have from willing and sympathizing sources. This is part of a new and improved system, introduced in 1834; and yet, in 1860, it is confessed that there has, with all this, been no real improvement on the previous condition of the poor! Similar results would be furnished by other State systems in Europe.

Is it to be wondered at, that during the last several decades, voices have been raised, earnestly and loudly, both in England and on the continent, in favor of another order; and is it not natural that men should begin to see, as many have done, that the evil is all to be traced to the divorce of charity from its true Christian idea, and a sundering of it from the holy ministry of the Church? Schleiermacher already touched the right chord when he said, in a sermon: "I think Christian benevolence would take its proper course, if it were brought back again to its original form in the Christian Church." Pressed by a sense of the evil which must result, when the Church surrenders this sacred work to the State, Dr. Chalmers restored the true ancient Christian method in the St. John's Church of Glasgow, as early as 1818, and continued it with great success.

In this congregation, poor in means, and with a membership of from ten to twelve thousand, the work was attended to with the most satisfactory financial and moral results, so that in 1841, Dr. Chalmers could publish his interesting tract: "On the sufficiency of the parochial system, without a poor rate, for the management of the poor," which was translated into German in 1847, by Dr. Gerlach, and did much to call the attention of German divines to the subject. Similar movements have since been inaugurated, and are carried forward with much promise, in Erlangen, Carlsruh, Gütersloh and Meiningen. These may be regarded as first-fruits of the blessed harvest of good which must accrue to the Church when this promising tendency shall have fully wrought out this holy problem.

In our own country, where, on account of the freedom of the Church from the State, there is such an admirable opportunity of restoring the alms-system to its original honor in the Church, the subject, strange enough, has not, as yet, generally elicited much public attention. While the free and liberal spirit that characterizes American Christianity has received the highest praise, the vitiating practical heresy that underlies it, though occasionally referred to, has not been laid hold of and unmasked, as the solemnity of the interest involved demands, nor has the true remedy been prominently brought out in any earnest and tangible attempt to restore the original idea of alms, and the Scriptural ministry required in the case.

In the Reformed Church, as we mentioned in the beginning of this article, the subject has for some years received more or less attention; and a beautiful donation, made to the Reformed congregation of Hagerstown, Maryland, on Christmas day last past, has practically inaugurated a movement looking in the right direction, which, we earnestly hope, may ultimately lead to similar results in all our congregations. One of its members, Hon. James Dixon Roman, on that day, sent in to the Consistory a document creating a fund of $5,000, the interest of which is to be distributed to the poor; accompanying it with a suggestion, which contemplated the virtual increase of the

fund, by adding to it the regular alms of the congregation—a suggestion which was accepted by the Consistory, and confirmed and established by their action. Thus, has this congregation restored in its bosom the true idea of almsgiving, as we have seen it to lie in the Scripture, and as we have shown it to have been practised in the apostolic and primitive Church.

The donor was desirous that the matter should have no publicity, beyond what was in the nature of the case necessary in the congregation, but on our representation that the fact itself, as a suggestive precedent, and especially the important views embodied in the document, might, and certainly would benefit the Church at large, he kindly yielded his own modest preferences, and allowed us to use it as we should think proper. We are sure that every thoughtful reader will find in it matter for useful reflection. But we will let it speak for itself.

To the Consistory of the German Reformed Church in Hagerstown:—

Humbly grateful to Almighty God for the worldly prosperity and many blessings which surround me, and for His special providence, in many cases rescuing me from great and imminent dangers, and especially for raising me from the verge of the grave more than a year ago, and my restoration since to comparative health, Christian duty prompts some manifestation of that feeling in such manner as may be deemed most acceptable in His sight, and according to His will; and the Christmas festal day presents a fitting occasion.

Human wisdom and philanthropy have said and written much on the vexed question: "By what agency can charity be extended to the poor, with the best and most practical results?" and long observation and reflection leads to the conclusion, that it can be best accomplished through the medium of the Church, making her and her agents the almoners who extend the helping hand, and enabling her to illustrate her benevolent purpose, and fortify the strength of her spiritual pleadings and exhortations, by mingling and infusing therein a needful supply of practical temporal benefits.

The order of Deaconesses, as established in Apostolic times (Rom. xvi. 1), and practised in the early ages of the Church, probably presents the most perfect organization of the best means adapted to this object, which the world has ever witnessed. It is proposed, therefore, to give to this church, as a perpetual endowment for such an order, Five Thousand dollars, now safely invested in first-class mortgage bonds, payable near twenty years hence, with coupons for the semi-annual interest, at seven per cent. It is further proposed, that three ladies of the congregation (whose names, when hereafter presented, will undoubtedly command the unanimous approval of the congregation), shall be chosen and ordained to the order of Deaconesses in this congregation, with the absolute control of the income of said fund, for the purposes and duties as practised in the early days of the Church.

But if this name or its associations should wound the prejudices or the sensibilities of the congregation, then, to give time for mature consideration of the question, it is suggested that the said three ladies shall be organized as a "Dorcas Society," or a "Phœbe Society," or, under such other name or title as they may prefer to assume for one or two years, when the question can be finally decided. But in either case, their powers and duties shall be the same as those practised by that ancient order, viz., to strengthen the weak, comfort the afflicted, cheer the down-hearted, and succor the poor and distressed; causing them to feel and believe, that, however friendless and forsaken by the world, their Heavenly Father, through His Church, is still watching with anxious care and helping hand, to lead them to a refuge in her sanctuary; and it is suggested, that in all cases, the charity should be extended on condition that the recipients shall attend the Church, and send their children, if any, to the Sunday-school of such denomination as they may prefer, without respect to their particular religious belief and confession.

The duties and responsibilities of these three ladies will be more arduous than the Church can possibly exact or require of its individual members, and therefore it is proposed, that they

shall retain, for their compensation, one hundred dollars of the fund, in each year, in equal proportions.

It is further suggested, in consideration of this, and as part of the arrangement, that the Consistory shall at once conform its action to the repeated orders of the Synod and Classis, by a permanent by-law, that the whole proceeds of the regular Sunday collections, taken while the pastor reads the "offertory," shall be treated as the alms of the congregation, and, as such, paid by the deacons to the said order or society, in aid of the fund hereby created. The proceeds from both sources will probably reach six hundred dollars per year, which, it is believed, can scarcely fail greatly to alleviate the sufferings of the poor, and materially expand and increase the influence and usefulness of the Sunday-school and Church.

This being, to some extent, an untried experiment in modern times, prudence suggests the necessity of providing for such changes and amendments as experience may discover to be more effectual in producing the desired result, and, therefore, the right is reserved to the donor, during his life or by testamentary direction, to alter or amend the instructions, objects and purposes of the fund, as he may find expedient; and if it should unfortunately fail in the good results so earnestly hoped and expected, he may revoke the donation, in whole or in part, and appropriate the fund to any other more hopeful charity, in the Church, or out of it, in his discretion.

If the Church shall, within thirty days, accept the gift on the terms and suggestions proposed, the bonds will be delivered to the ladies, or the Treasurer, and the coupons for the first half-year's interest, due July 1st, 1867, will be paid in advance, as a fund for immediate operations.

J. DIXON ROMAN.

December 25th, 1866.

The suggestion in regard to devoting the alms to the same object, was accepted. The preference of the donor, in regard to the office of Deaconesses, is left for the present unrealized, with a view to its further consideration. This was wisely anticipated by him, and hence he has made provision for the bene-

fits of the fund to go into operation under substantially the same form. The three ladies have been designated, and they accept the duties it involves, but with pious large-heartedness decline the compensation, which the donor generously provides in his proposition. Thus the benefit of the fund, together with the merciful ministrations of those in whose hands it is placed, went into immediate effect.

The beautiful document accompanying the donation, with the truly venerable and Christian ideas in regard to the temporal and bodily ministry of the Church, by a restoration of the "order of Deaconesses as established in Apostolic times (Rom. xvi. 1), and practised in the early ages of the Church," receives additional importance from the character of its author. As Mr. Roman, though in comparative health at the time this offering was made to the Church, died only a few weeks afterward, we are at liberty of saying, in this connection, what would otherwise have been improper. He was a man possessed of one of the clearest and most vigorous minds we have ever met. One of the very first lawyers in the State of Maryland, he was also, at different times, honored with high civil positions in his State and in the nation, having been a member of Congress, and also the delegate from Maryland in the Peace Conference at the outbreak of the late war. Though he had for some years retired from public life, and also from the active duties of his profession, he was often consulted in important public affairs, and his comprehensive judgment was always treated with the highest confidence and respect. But he attained the highest honor, when, a few years ago, won by the blessed power of Christianity, he voluntarily, humbly, and in the most child-like faith, appeared at the altar of the Church, and by Holy Baptism, was made a member of Christ's family, and afterwards received "the most comfortable communion of the body and blood of our Lord." So he himself regarded it, and so spoke of it. We may here add, that though possessed always of strong and reverent religious instincts, and a regular attendant upon public worship in the particular communion with which traditional relations had associated him, his deeply reflecting

mind could not consent to the particular form of doctrine to which he had been accustomed to listen. Providentially, he came for a time under the teachings which are now generally called "Mercersburg Theology," which at once commended themselves to his mind and heart. It was this, in fact, that at first arrested, and afterward satisfied his mind so fully, that it led him to baptism and the communion of the Church. The new light which he received from this source, as he often said, was his abiding joy and inward satisfaction. It was, moreover, by earnest meditation on the nature, true mission, and power of Christianity, and especially its human and merciful side, as a remedial economy for all the ills of human life, that led his mind in the direction of the true idea of Christian charity, as unfolded in his proposition paper, and prompted the beautiful gift referred to above.

We regard it providential, that this subject has thus been brought to the mind and heart of the Church in a practical form. Should we not make proper use of it, by subjecting the whole matter of almsgiving to fresh and earnest investigation?

What the Church needs in respect to this whole interest is, first of all, fully to right its mind and heart on the subject of the true Christian idea of almsgiving, and then to restore in its bosom the Diaconate to its true original honor and vitality. This holy office, though in some branches of the Christian Church wholly ignored and set aside, and in others raised (?) out of its true sphere into a grade of the clerical office, and in others still—our own among the rest!—shorn of its honor and power by being almost entirely dissociated from the idea of a sacred ministry to the needy, was formally, clearly, and indisputably instituted by the holy apostles, and was in force throughout all apostolic times, as the ministry of the Church-alms to the poor (Acts vi. 1—8). This is as clear as the noonday sun.* This office is the more striking in its origin,

* We are aware that some refer to Stephen and Philip, who were among the Deacons ordained (Acts vi), and tell us that they were not merely ministers of alms, but ministers in the sense of those, whom we reckon in the class of the higher clergy.

inasmuch as it was not, like the office of Elder, based on Old Testament precedent—Elders having been officers in the Jewish synagogues—but a purely new and original New Testament office; and beside, we may ever contemplate with sacred pleasure the fact, that holy Stephen, who was the first Christian martyr, also stands at the head of the first list of elected and ordained Deacons!

It is not necessary here to enlarge on the divine origin of this sacred office, nor particularly to define the nature of the office itself. Our readers, of the Reformed Church, are bound by solemn order and confession, to clear and decided words on this point. Let us hear them afresh: "The office of the Deacons is to collect the alms and other contributions which are designed for the relief of the poor, or the necessities of the congregation; to distribute the alms willingly and conscientiously; and to provide for the support of the ministry of the

On this point, we again translate from Löhe. "Stephen performed miracles, and this also others did in the congregation who were neither Presbyters, nor Deacons, nor Prophets et cet. The miracles of Stephen attracted attention, and his enemies began to dispute (συζητεῖν vi. 9) with him: disputing, however, is not teaching, not preaching; but it belonged to every one—especially according to Jewish custom—who had taste and gift in that way. The discourse of Stephen, before the holy council, was no sermon, but a defensive speech, for which the Lord has promised to every one "mouth and wisdom." The speech of Stephen is a powerful one, which rises ever higher till it reaches to the words of a prophet, and finally to the vision of a prophet; but a sermon, a didactic discourse, it was not; much less can we conclude from it, that there belonged to the deacon, *as such*, the office of a teacher. The reference to the great teaching activity of Philip seems to be of more force, but actually is not. For Philip taught when the congregation at Jerusalem was scattered, and with it its deacons, since the office of the diaconate was, for the congregation to which he belonged, destroyed. The diaconate binds to place and congregation. That Philip, *as Deacon*, neither baptized or taught, is evident from the simple fact that he was an *Evangelist*. (Acts xxi. 8.) The Evangelist travels, the Deacon is located; the Evangelist preaches and baptizes, the Deacon ministers to his poor. These are very different offices, and they ought as little to have been confounded in the process of time, as in the first Church. After the duties of the spiritual office had once began to be devolved upon the Deacons, as such, these were made to predominate even more and more, till at length the diaconate ceased to be a ministry to the poor, and became a spiritual ministerial office, which was prejudicial to the Presbyteriate, till finally, the sacred ministry to the poor among Christians wholly disappeared, and the care of the poor became a matter of the State. The Diaconate is a ministry to the poor, and, *as such, a holy office in the Church*. This, according to the New Testament, must be firmly held. *Löhe's Aphorismen*, pp. 90, 91.

Gospel."* This very properly, and in perfect accordance with the teachings of the holy Scriptures, makes all the offerings of the Church constitute *one fund*, out of which all the needs of the Church are to be provided for—the poor, the holy ministry, and all the necessities of the Church—and places this fund in the hands of the Deacons, to whom, by solemn ordination, the whole ministry of the Church funds is committed. Moreover, this *one* fund, in the hands of the Deacons, includes not merely regular alms offered in the regular worship, but also all "other contributions," so that charities needed for the general operations of the Church, as a whole, go in like manner to the altar of the Church into the *one* alms fund, and so through the divinely ordained ministry of the Diaconate to their proper destination.

We must here adopt, with all our heart, the words of Löhe: "We mourn that this office has sunken into inefficiency, and its holy field of activity fallen in the hands of another power (the State). Resurrection of the holy Diaconate of the Christians—this is just what our times need!"

The neglect and inefficiency into which the sacred office of Deacon has fallen, would furnish occasion for many earnest words. But we can pursue this particular part of the subject no further at this time. We commend it to the earnest consideration and action of the Church, with the hope that this important office, which happily still holds its place in our cultus, at least in a constitutional and traditional way, may yet be restored to its full practical honor and power. We must devote the remainder of our space to another aspect of the same sacred office—that of DEACONESS—an office which, as we shall see, has equally apostolic precedent and authority, but which has not maintained its existence with the same prominence and historical continuity as that of the male Diaconate. This is all the more to be regretted and deplored, as this peculiar office furnishes occasion for the exercise of legitimate divinely-ap-

* Constitution, chap. iii, Art. 2. See, also, the clear and beautiful teachings of the "Order of Worship for the Reformed Church," on this subject, pp. 233, 234.

pointed and greatly needed Christian activity in the Church, which is otherwise either wholly lost, or can be brought into use only in an unregulated, occasional, and, therefore, comparatively inefficient way—the merciful ministry of women—a ministry intended by heaven, and needed in earth, and one which, if dispensed with by the Church, in its divinely-ordered and regulated form, ever makes its presence felt, in the way of free spontaneous activity, in a form of human devising, thus protesting against the violence done to it. It is a talent, which, by its very presence and spontaneous activity, thus ever claims its right in the Church, and, whenever suppressed or forgotten, presses forward and creates its own forms of activity.

In most Christian congregations, in the present day, are found associations of pious females, united in some good work for themselves and for others. This is itself a prophecy of a great truth not now in the horizon of the Church's vision—a fact which calls up to the devout and thoughtful many pleasant and sacred memories in the past of Christianity; and has also much in it to cheer the present, and render hopeful the future, as it shall take up again and regularly employ the Christian talent of woman. It has been well and truly said that women are half the world, and greatly more than half the Church. We would add, and by far the largest part of heaven, beyond a doubt.

In regard to woman, in a general way, we may affirm, that in nothing is the religion which has its origin from heaven, more distinguished from all religions that spring from earth, than in the view it takes of her character, spiritual force, and the sphere and mission it assigns to her. There is scarcely more difference between a human being and a brute, than between a Christian and a pagan woman. What a poor, degraded, and jaded slave she is there! What an elevated and elevating angel of love and mercy here!

It is not, on the one hand, a slander of woman to say that in her degradation are the seeds and sources of general social degradation; nor, on the other hand, is it flattery to affirm, that in her elevation is the sure pledge of the intellectual, moral, and religious elevation of the entire social circle. Paradise and

Bethlehem verify this remark. Through woman came sin—through woman came the Saviour. Of Paradise and Bethlehem, of Eve and the blessed Virgin Mary, we may truly say as Paul did of Hagar and Sarah, they are an allegory, or type—the one a bond-woman unto sin and sorrow, the other free unto promise and hope. The tenderest and most impressible, heaven and hell alike seem to seek access into the race, and into the world, through her. Satan and Christ, sin and piety, find in her their first, most fitting, and most prominent instrument. Paganism, as the kingdom of Satan, holds power in the world through the degradation of woman. Christianity, as the kingdom of Christ, triumphs in and through her elevation.

Her power is earliest active, and is applied where the advantage is greatest. Men may guard the orchards, and gather in the ripened fruit; but hers are the nurseries, and to her is committed the shaping of the infant plants. She is the priestess of the inner circle, ministering in that secluded holy of holies, where the most important meetings between God and man take place—where all holiness and piety begin and centre.

Nor is her influence confined to this inner circle, to end there. Far from it. No more, indeed, than streams end in their fountains, or the history of plants in the nursery. As in the dreams of ancient fable, the tiny drops which the nymphs in the quiet nooks of the mountains gathered into streams and rivers for the ocean, those the naiads of the sea reformed and sent back as dew upon the mountains; so the silent influences which go forth from the inner circles of Christian homes return again in blessings upon their source. And who shall tell their blessed history, meanwhile, through all the ranks and ranges of social life? What, compared with their quiet, blessed influence, is that of stillest streams that water fairest meadows:

> "Or of rills that slip
> Through the cleft rock, and chiming as they fall
> Upon loose pebbles, lose themselves at length
> In matted grass, that with a livelier green
> Betrays the secret of their silent course."

While Christianity thus shows to women the true power of their home influence, and their glorious mission in the inner sphere of society, it is also the only system that brings them out properly into their public position, and employs their power and blessed ministry in the open world of sinning, suffering, and sorrowing human life.

Christianity does not regard women as jewels that are to shine only in caskets, or lights that are to be put under a bushel. False systems may cant about women's right to go forth as men; Christianity, as beautifully as truly, grants them the privilege to go forth as women—a right which no paganism ever conferred—a privilege which no modern reformatory socialistic systems have grace to bestow. They claim for them the right, and, by a most unwomanly culture, prepare them to go forth with the sternness of men to be first bluffed, and at last hated; but Christianity alone gives them the right and the grace to go forth with the mien and bent of a modest angel, in whose presence rough hearts shall be silent, and broken spirits bloom with new hope. If it were necessary to show how Christianity calls out the ministry of women, we might speak of Miriam, and Deborah, and the prophetesses—of Anna, the Marys, Martha, Salome, and the "many women" which ministered with, and unto, our Saviour while he lived, and stood in silent love and sorrow around the cross when He died—of Dorcas, Priscilla, Phœbe, Stachys, Triphina, and Triphosa, and the beloved Persis, which were the Apostle's helpers in Christ Jesus.

Nothing better shows the need which Christianity has of female help, than the practice in the apostolic and primitive Church of employing such help in a formal and official way. That there existed in the apostolic and early Church the office or order of Deaconesses, no trusty commentator or well-informed historical theologian doubts.* The higher ministry of the word and sa-

* If it were necessary to prove the existence of the office of Deaconess in the apostolic and primitive Church, it would be easy to quote enough to make a small volume. We refer the reader to Bingham's Christian Antiquities, vol. i. pp. 99—104, where a whole chapter is devoted to the historical aspects of this subject. Neander's His. of the Church, Bohn's Ed., vol. i. p. 262, vol. iii. pp. 221—224; Robinson's Calmut, Art. Deaconess, pp. 358, 359 Herzog's Real-Encyclopedia, vol. iii. pp. 368,

craments was one office—that of Elder was another, whose duties were purely spiritual,—then there was the office of Deacon, whose ministry was to the body, to the temporal wants of the poor, and through their attentions to their bodily wants, also to lead their spirits to Christ, even as in Christ's ministry the wretched were drawn to Him by His relieving their bodily wants. The office of Deaconess, or female Deacons, was entrusted with this same ministry among their own sex.

This office is distinctly mentioned in the New Testament. Phœbe was a διακονον of the church at Cenchrea. (Rom. vi. 1.) The word is translated "a servant," by which the office is a little hidden; but it is well known, and acknowledged by all commentators, that the word designates the office of Deaconess, the existence of which office, as we have said, no well-informed theologian has ever called in question. The office of deaconess existed from the apostles down to the tenth century in the Latin Church, and to the twelfth in the Greek. The Latin Church first began to suppress it in the fifth and sixth century. It was not one of the least of the corruptions of that Church, as Dr. Neander says, "When exaggerated notions about the magical effects of ordination and the dignity of the clerical order became continually more prominent," to set aside the Deaconesses, to make room for droves of idle monks, who cost more, and did less.

As Deaconesses, the Church always selected females of superior piety, intelligence, and address. Sometimes young females noted for piety; but this not often. Generally women from forty to sixty years of age, who were either unmarried ladies or widows, were chosen. Devout widows were preferred, who had trained up children; because it was supposed that they had not only the necessary patience and experience for the office, but had learned to be tender and compassionate in their affections, and so able to sympathize with destitute females, and neglected or forsaken children.

The Deaconesses were regularly ordained to the office by the laying on of hands, in the same way as other sacred officers of

---

369; Dr. Schaff's His. of the Apostolic Church, pp. 535—537; Löhe Aphorismen, &c., pp. 92—95.

the Church were inducted. The beautiful prayer used at such solemnities is still extant. It runs thus: "Eternal God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Creator of man and woman; Thou who didst fill with Thy Spirit Miriam, Deborah, Hannah, and Huldah; Thou who didst vouchsafe to a woman the birth of Thy only-begotten Son; Thou who didst, in the tabernacle and in the temple, place female keepers of Thy holy gates;—look down now also upon this Thy handmaid, and bestow on her the Holy Ghost, that she may worthily perform the work committed to her, to Thy honor, and to the glory of Christ. Amen." *

The duties of the Deaconesses, as already hinted, were the same as those of the Deacons, only their ministrations were confined to women and children among the poor and wretched. They acted as catechists, preparing ignorant females for baptism, privately instructing them and their children in religion. Their path of mercy lay among sick and afflicted poor women, especially among such as were found in the dark places of sin and shame, to which only females could have access without scandal, to carry words of hope and hands of help to the frail and fallen. Like a ray from the sun of heaven, that can shine into the vilest carcass, without being itself polluted, these pure Deaconesses could move among the lowest and vilest of their sex, to lift them up, without a whisper of scandal against their fair fame. Many a Magdalene did they bring to the cross of Him, whose blood can cleanse from sin, those who, in the eyes of the world, and even in the sense of their own shame and fears, "dare not seek repentance."

What a power and ministry has the Church lost, by losing the office of Deaconess! "Is it not remarkable?" it is well asked by Calmet, "that the office, which is so well adapted to the matronly character of the female sex, should be *wholly* excluded from our list of assistants in the Church?" What a pity that the Reformation did not restore it! It is interesting, however, to refer to the fact, that its restoration was seriously and earnestly thought of, and even attempted, in the Reformed Church, at an

---

* Neander, Hist. of the Ch., vol. iii. p. 222.

early period of the Reformation, namely, when the Netherland "churches under the cross," were being founded through the Synod of Wesel and Emden, 1568 and 1571. We translate from Max Göbel.* Speaking of the office of Deacon, as now again instituted in its original character as a ministry to the poor, he says: "The question in regard to the restoration of the office of Deaconesses, which incontrovertibly existed in the apostolic age, engaged the attention of our Church at that time; and only the more, because it already existed among the Bohemian Brethren, and the strict Anabaptists, at least in the large congregations." The records of the Classis of Wesel, of 1579, contains, on this subject, the following: "It has been asked by the brethren of Wesel, whether it would not be a good thing, in the churches and congregations where necessity and propriety should demand it, namely, on account of sick women, to restore the office of Deaconesses. Since it has hitherto not been done in any Reformed congregation, it has been regarded proper to establish it again. They ask, whether only widows, or also actual wives, with the consent of their husbands, should be elected to this office; and whether only persons of sixty years old, or also such as are under sixty, may be regarded eligible? (1 Tim. v.)" This question is deferred until the next meeting of Classis, in order that the congregations may have time fully to counsel on this subject among themselves. As regards those who are already called, they shall continue till the Classis has decided upon the matter; unless it should prove that any are desirous of being relieved from the duties involved, in that case it shall be granted to them. At the second following meeting, 1580, the Brethren now set forth: "If this office, which had fallen into disuse and decay in the Church of God, is again to be restored, then it shall be established in the same form and character as it is described by the Apostle Paul; namely, widows, and not married women, shall be taken for that purpose. As to their age, it is the view of the Brethren, that it is lawful to take

* Geschichte des christlichen Lebens in der rhein-westphälischen evangelischen Kirche. Von Max Göbel, vol. i. pp. 413, 414.

such as may be four or five years older than sixty years, in case the other qualifications demanded by St. Paul should be found in them; yet the age mentioned by St. Paul should be adhered to as nearly as possible. The Brethren also regard it advisable to call the attention of the next Provincial Synod to this matter, that the office may also be restored in other places. This was also actually done in 1581, at the General Synod of Middleburg; which Synod, however, in answer to the question: 'Whether it is advisable to re-establish the office of Deaconess,' replied: 'No; on account of various inconveniences which might arise out of it. But in times of pestilence, and other sicknesses, when any service is required among sick women, which would be indelicate to Deacons, they ought to attend to these through their wives, or others, whose services it may be suitable to engage.' Herewith this question, and with it the interest itself, appears to have been dropped in the Netherland Reformed Church." Has it been dropped in the Reformed Church for ever?

An effort has been made, in late years, in Europe, to restore it, though not exactly in its apostolic and primitive form and character. These Deaconesses labor, not in congregations, but rather in institutions, where orphans, and other lonely and forsaken classes are received and cared for by their ministry.* The movement has grown to be very extensive, and has been crowned with marked success; and its good fruits have strongly recommended it to many earnest and pious minds.

Whether ever we shall have the office restored in its original form, the future must decide. But until it shall be restored in form, may we not have it meanwhile in fact and in spirit, as in the case referred to in the congregation at Hagerstown. Every approach to it ought to fill our hearts with joy and hope; and wherever we see pious women banded together in a good work for the Church and for the souls of the destitute, we ought to feel that the words of Paul are addressed to us: "I entreat thee, help those women which labor with us, whose names are

* See an Article, by Dr. Wichern, on Diakonen-und Diakonissenhäuser, in Herzog's Encyk., vol. iii. pp. 369—384. A full and able article.

in the book of life." Moreover, why should the Church hesitate to confer this venerable office upon such as already possess its spirit, and, in a measure, actually perform its holy duties, and thus, by the unction, grace, and authority of a sacred and divinely-instituted office, endow, with still greater power for good, and so suitably encourage and aid those who have the heart, and the piety, and the self-denial, to perform the duties of this tender and sacred ministry. There are in all our congregations noble women, who have the intelligence, the matronly dignity, the Christian prudence, the holy wisdom, the deep-toned piety, and the steady every-day zeal to be Dorcases and Phœbes. We may add, that there are such also who, with the qualifications, have also the necessary leisure to fulfil these duties. Let them go forth, in the name of Jesus, on missions of daily mercy to the poor, the neglected sick, the degraded by sin; and let the Church, let Christians give them encouragement, and place in their hands the means of extending relief—means to clothe poor children, to afford some substantial comfort to struggling mothers, to bear the alms from its altar, as the holy greeting of the Church, to cheer them in their loneliness and sorrow, and ever leave glad hearts behind them, as the sacred memorials of their merciful visits.

What a field for this kind of work lies around us! What scores of subjects, which can only be reached, and be taught to hope, by such a merciful ministry. Take one example, as a representation of many. There is a family. You enter it at any hour of the day, and what do you see? On all sides are the cheerless aspects of a home in poverty. That worn and weary-looking woman is the mother of a half-dozen of children, the care of which breaks down her strength, and would break down her heart, if it were not a mother's heart! The husband is, perchance, a worthless drunkard—or if not that, he has no Christian feelings—a mere droning boarder in the house. His leisure hours, his evenings, and his Sundays, are spent with others of his like. She is alone—alone in her cares, responsibilities, and sorrows! She cannot go to Church. She is bound down as a slave to her prison, the only light of which is her

children. She has no time, perhaps not the ability, perhaps even no more the disposition, to instruct her growing family. She cannot clothe them for Sunday-school. As they grow up, they pass beyond her power, and are disciplined on the street; and while some bear heavily upon her weary arms, others are beginning to tread, in a way still more painful, upon her heart!

This is only one picture of many. Do such need no sympathy, no counsel, no aid in their toil, no visits of mercy in their wearisome and heart-broken way? Who can meet their wants? No pastor, no elder, no deacon; none but one of their own sex—one who can approach them with such words as they can feel and return—one to whom they can open their hearts in full confidence, and to whom they can and will tell all the details of their troubles, anxieties, and wants.

We cannot dwell on the endless variety of cases which call for the ministry of women, and which cannot be reached by any other instrumentality. Who does not know that there are scores of poor, ignorant, and even degraded females, around us, who could be nursed into life, love, and hope, if approached and befriended by the visits of Christ in the persons of the pious of their own sex.

The Church needs more—let us thank God for those we have—but the Church needs more Marys, Marthas, Dorcases, Phœbes, Priscillas, Triphinas, Triphosas, and Perses, Florence Nightingales, and Harriet Newells. The merciful spirit of Jesus Christ, the man of mercy, must return to earth in the persons of His devoted children! "Rise up, ye women that are at ease; hear my voice, ye careless daughters."*

Read the Gospels, and how dost thou read? See how Jesus ever approached the souls of the wretched through their bodies. He connected spiritual with natural healing. He even drew the hungry to Himself, by giving them bread. He hesitated not to make Himself the guest and companion of the lowest class of sinners, that He might raise them up. Through mercy

* Isaiah xxxii. 9.

to the body, He carried life to the soul. Let His Church go and do likewise.

When the Church receives this baptism of mercy, what havoc it will make of certain existing forms and fashions of society! They that will then be chief, will be those who best serve the lowliest. The title to the highest rank in society will then be that grace which makes the heart most sweetly at home among the frail, the fallen, the groaning, sighing captives, and slaves of sin. Not those will be first-class, who can move most gracefully in the parlor or ball-room; but those who are most like angels in the huts of the struggling poor! Not those who can give the most brilliant entertainments to those who are rich as themselves, and who need it not; but those whose charities among the needy, will bear to their hearts a sense of the reality of that religion, which brings cheer to the sorrowing, and causes the heart of the widow and orphan to sing. They shall be highest, who obey best our Saviour's glorious words: "Call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind; and thou shalt be blessed: for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just."

It seems as if it had been the design of our Saviour, in rescuing Mary Magdalene from the lowest and most degraded level—for she was, by the consent of the whole Church, a "frail woman"—and making her the associate of the purest women the world ever saw, even of Mary, the Virgin Mother of Christ, to teach the world how grace and mercy unite the highest and lowest, the purest and most defiled; and, at the same time, to teach us that the vilest are redeemable, and are the proper and hopeful subjects of a ministry of mercy.

In view of her ruin and recovery, none need despair in hoping for their own salvation; and no one, longing and laboring for the rescue of the vilest, need despair of success. In her ruin, she was possessed of "seven devils." Seven was the number denoting perfection among the Jews. The expression imports that she was perfectly in Satan's power. In her heart, was Satan's seat, and in her life, the full exhibition of his foul purposes and power. She, even she, was redeemed! Not only

redeemed, but exalted and honored in the circle of the purest and the best.

Here, is encouragement for a ministry among the fallen. Here are the promises actualized, and can be laid hold of in flesh and blood! Here we see the victory of grace. "Of all those to whom much has been forgiven, she is the first: of all the tears since ruefully shed at the foot of the cross of suffering, hers were the first: of all the hopes which the Resurrection has since diffused through nations and generations of men, hers were the first." With her "sorrowing image" before them, how many have looked up through tears, hoping and believing in Jesus, who receiveth sinners, and saves to the uttermost all who come to God by Him.

How strong and moving is the call of Christianity for the merciful labors of women, in view of what it has done for them, and in view of the encouragements furnished by its own examples of piety and devotion. What motives to her to live for a high and holy purpose in any sphere in which she is called to move. Is she poor, let her be a model of patience. Is she rich, let her be an example of humility and charity. Is she above others in cultivation, let her not look still higher in scorn, but like the sun, which is also high, shine down upon the lowly with generous, warming, beautifying beams. Has she leisure, let her devote it to acts of mercy. In short, like her prototypes, let her aim to be longest at every cross of suffering with tears of sympathy, and first at every tomb of buried hopes, with spices to embalm what even her love cannot rescue from the embraces of death.

What talent, what influence, what time, what means, are wasted by the worldly and vain of women!—offered at the shrine of pride and fashion: offerings that ought to be made for the sinning and suffering for whom Jesus died! What time is given to the ball-room and toilet, that should be spent in the lanes, huts, and garrets. What sympathies and tears are wasted over the morbid pages of the last novel, that ought to be mingled with the tears of Jesus, once shed on Olivet over sinners! Woe to those who roll in extravagance, loll in drowsy

idleness, and dance with the vain, while the neglected poor die around them! The day cometh when the Lord shall give a scab for a crown, baldness for set hair, sackcloth for rustling robes, and burning for beauty!

In whom, in the day of judgment, does Jesus behold himself? In the hungry—the thirsty—the stranger—the naked—the sick—in those in prison! In these, he sees himself also, now; and what is done to the least of these, is done to Him!

We cannot drop the solemn and important subject in hand, without humbly suggesting how the results and conclusions reached in this discussion, may be made a practical power in the Church. As we said in the beginning, it is not theories and speculations with which we have been concerned, but rather with a most living and deeply practical Christian and Scriptural truth. The full restoration of the true idea of alms, almsgiving, and alms-ministry, as now set forth, is not an impracticable theory, but as feasible and capable of being realized, as it is divinely true.

Is it not, we earnestly ask, the other false systems into which the Church has glided, that have proved themselves impracticable? Has not this false spirit, as it has introduced itself into our congregations, robbed the poor of their alms? Have the alms not been either sacrilegiously devoted to the current expenses of the congregation, or else has not the collecting of them during the service, and as a part of it, in many cases been entirely banished from the Church? Has not the diaconate, in its true original character and intent, lost its place and power as a ministry? With perhaps a few exceptions, is not this generally true? Why is this so? Is it not because the true idea of Christian alms has passed out of the mind of the Church, and given place to a spirit which is not at all Christian? Who denies this, in the face of all the facts? Here, then, the innovating system has not only proved its own scheme impracticable, but it has actually shown itself incapable of even conserving the idea of the solemn interest which it has unhappily taken in hand.

Then, how is it in regard to the alms of the Church, as they relate to the general needs of the Church as a whole? How has the innovating system acquitted itself, in making provision for the general charitable operations and interests of the Church—such as Missions, Foreign and Domestic, Beneficiary Education, Church Extension, Orphans' Homes, and other enterprises? Though it must be gratefully acknowledged, that there is a growth in this respect, yet is it not annually confessed with shame in all the Reports on these subjects made to Synod, that the funds are far from being adequate to the most pressing demands; and, above all, that the amount contributed bears no manner of proportion to the actual ability and wealth of the Church? Are there not many congregations which furnish positively no aid to these interests? Then, has not the Synod repeatedly devised, and proposed, and enjoined plans designed to call out the general charity of the Church; and have not all these proved almost entirely impracticable and powerless?

The Church has especially made efforts to introduce plans of systematic benevolence. Well-matured plans of this kind were adopted and proposed, with all the sanctions of synodical authority. At one time, a tract on "Systematic Benevolence" was published and circulated; and then again, a little volume, "The Lord's Portion"—all by Synod, with a view to calling out the alms of the *whole* Church, of *all* its congregations and members. Whatever may have been the partial results of all this labor, it never effected the general result desired. Yet, if there is one conviction deeper than another in the minds of all interested, it is that, the very thing desirable is to bring about a plan of *systematic giving that shall reach every member of the Church.* It has also been universally acknowledged that there are few, if any, in the Church, who would not be disposed to give something in a regular way, if only the opportunity of giving could be brought *directly before them.* Why, then, has not this plan of systematic giving been a success? The only reasonable and true answer is, the plan has been defective, impracticable; and it has been so, *because it is not the*

true Scriptural plan. The Scriptural plan is the one, the fundamental principle of which has been unfolded in this article. It is systematic, it is practicable, and it will succeed just as sure as every thing succeeds, which has the wisdom of God's unerring mind in it.

But, before we draw out in brief detail the main features of this divine plan of systematic almsgiving, let us sum up the annual results of the present reigning system in the Church. The following is the amount contributed to the various objects in the year ending October, 1866:

Beneficiary Education (Eastern Synod),	$4,169.49
Domestic Missions (Eastern and Western Synods),	12,161.56
Foreign Missions (Eastern and Western Synods),	716.93
Orphans' Home (Eastern and Western Synods),	15,000.00
	$32,047.98
Add for Beneficiary Education for the Western Synod, say one-fourth as much as has been given in the Eastern,	1,050.00
Total,	$33,097.98

We have omitted the $7,548.39 for Church extension, because this, as we know, is mostly collected in an altogether different way from the rest. But, suppose we even add it, and then we have in all, $40,646.37. Much of this was collected by "special effort," by extraordinary pushings and appeals; and a good part of it came from Sunday-school children in a silent, systematic way. This, then, is the alms of 1,162 congregations, 109,258 confirmed members, and 70,432 unconfirmed members—179,690 members in all—not quite 23 cents to each member.

Now, suppose you adopt the Scriptural plan of almsgiving at the regular Lord's day service; and, making allowance for children too small to appear at Church or Sunday-school, count only 150,000 members; then, let the number of congregations which have two services on Sunday and one in the week, make

up for those congregations which have not service every Sunday; then, count the alms only one cent at each service, fifty-two a year, and you have $78,000 annually.

Or, base your calculation on another classification of the data. Take the 1,162 congregations, and divide them into four classes, of (in round numbers) 290 congregations in each class. Estimate the amount of alms in each class as follows:

One-fourth	$ 50 each, =	$14,500
One-fourth	75 each, =	21,750
One-fourth	100 each, =	29,000
One-fourth	200 each, =	58,000
You have a total, annually, of		$123,250

The estimate here made is low. The lowest being less than $1 each Sunday, and the highest, which includes those congregations where there are two services every Sunday, would be less than $2 each service. Besides, this would be reduced nearly, if not one-half, by the weekly service and the Sunday-school service. In few Sunday-schools alone, the amount contributed each Sunday, falls below 50 cents, and in many it ranges from $1 up to $4.

Then, let it be kept in mind, that, by adopting the Scriptural plan, all "special" collections would be abolished. This fact, known and felt, would itself directly increase the regular alms-offerings.

Now, let us suppose a congregation, in which this Scriptural idea of alms is inaugurated. The members are duly informed of the nature of the plan—that the alms-offering is a religious act, a part of the regular worship in each service—that to come without alms is the same as to come without prayers or praise. They know that there are no "special collections" at any time—that there are no "special objects" to be severally sustained, as missions, education, orphans, &c., but that the Church knows of, and needs, only ONE *alms-treasury*—that this treasury is to be supplied regularly by the alms-offerings. They learn that the offering of alms is fixed at a *certain point in the service*,

just like the Hymn, the Prayer, the Sermon. When the service has proceeded to that point, "the minister, standing at the altar," reads the Scripture *Sentences* having reference to almsgiving, and selected for that purpose (see the "Order of Worship for the Reformed Church," pp. 175, 176), while the deacons receive the alms of the worshippers. Then, as the rubric directs: "The collection shall be brought by the deacons, in a proper vessel provided for that purpose, to the minister; who shall then reverently place it upon the altar, as an oblation presented unto God."

How impressive this service! Here, the true idea of alms, as an act of worship, and an offering to God on the altar of the Church, is externalized before the eyes and the heart of the worshipper. He does not feel as if a rude, intrusive secularity had suddenly broken in upon the service of the sanctuary; but, on the contrary, he realizes that *this* offering of alms is truly, in itself, a most impressive, edifying, and divinely acceptable part of the sacred service.

Let us see! What is before the worshipper in this act of offering his alms. First of all, *memory* or reflection is at work. His thoughts go back to his own home. He calls to mind how he has been preserved and prospered during the week. He thinks of his bread by day, and his sheltered rest by night. He recalls every mercy of God's providence, and every progress in his own temporal calling. While his heart is thus awakening to live gratitude, he reaches for his alms—no, not yet! There is another element operative. With these grateful remembrances, he sees every form of earthly *need* coming up before him. His mind and heart make an excursion through the lanes and alleys. He wanders among the huts, hovels, and garrets of the poor! He sees crowds of forlorn and poverty-oppressed women, and ragged, hungry, shivering, unschooled and neglected children! They gather around him, as if to ask him to contrast his own home, his own children, his own worldly circumstances, his own comforts and hopes, with theirs! Then, there pass before his vision a company of poor, but talented and pious young men, who feel themselves called to the Holy Ministry,

but who have not the means to carry them through the necessary preparatory course of study. A little farther out, he sees a class of faithful pastors laboring in pioneer settlements, in a thin and populated district, among small, poor, and struggling congregations. These seem to say to him, contrast your own well-provided church, your own favored congregation, your own regular Sunday church privileges, with our scarcity and destitution. Then, in the distance he sees crowds of orphan children, which have been gathered by the Church into "Homes." They are the touching relics of sacrifice and blood offered by a brave father, whose body sleeps on the glorious fields of Antietam, Gettysburg, Fredericksburg, the Wilderness, Vicksburg or Richmond! Or, they are the precious contributions made to the Church by some departed father and mother, whose life was consumed in care for them, amid unwearied struggles with adversity, while "some unhappy sad disaster, followed fast, and followed faster," until life was for them converted into one "melancholy burden" of woe, from which only death at length brought them rest! All these—and what more?—crowd around the grateful worshipper, as he is about to engage in this alms-offering part of the service; and all the while the Sentences from the lips of the minister, with a priestly solemnity, are sounding into his ears and sinking into his heart, with all the profound majesty of a *Dies iræ!* Thus:

He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly!

He hath dispersed abroad; he hath given to the poor: *his righteousness endureth forever!*

Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, *nor trust in uncertain riches*, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate.

To do good and communicate forget not; for with such *sacrifices* God is well pleased.

Whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth his bowels of compassion from him, *how dwelleth the love of God in him?*

He that hath pity upon the poor *lendeth unto the Lord;* and that which he hath given will He pay him again.

Remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how *He* said: *It is more blessed to give than to receive!*

Is he now ready to worship in this act truly, and to his own edification? Yea, his heart is full and his alms, as it drops from his hands *directly into God's hand*, will be embalmed in penitence, humility, gratitude, prayer, and praise. Then, he sees it carried to the altar, and there placed as before the face of Jesus Christ! While the worship goes on, a sweet voice says to his humble faith, in words that have now to him a far higher sense than they ever had to Cornelius: "Thy prayer is heard, and thine alms are had in remembrance before God!"

Is not this worship? Is not this divine devotion of almsgiving, even when—as all worship offered in our sad state of earthly infirmity, is—only approximatingly actualized a most solemn and affecting worship? In what beautiful, though also fearful contrast, does this true Christian character of it stand, with that miserable caricature, which has thrust itself into the very heart and life of the Church! Will any one say, that this true idea is impracticable, that it cannot be realized, and would not be successful? Once admit that it is the true idea, and is it not infidelity outright to permit it to go unactualized, to say nothing of the unbelieving fear that it cannot be restored to the Church? Has Christianity no power to cleanse its own holy temple, and to restore all the elements of its own blessed cultus? He that admits this, consciously or unconsciously, blasphemes God! The truth cannot be stated in softer terms.

Let this order of alms-offering be restored to the Church. It is the only mode which will truly please God, and be a true blessing, both to those who give, and those who receive. It will give to the Church a systematic plan of almsgiving,—the only one which can really reach *all* the members of the Church. Let the Synods, the Classes, the Consistories, the pastors, and all who believe, and can therefore speak, pronounce upon it as the only true wisdom of God on this subject, and it will be gloriously

enthroned in every congregation in less than three years. Then, in place of the low estimate above put as the probable aggregate alms of the Church, it will be found that we are even still too low in our estimate, when we set down our 1,162 congregations, as follows:

One-fourth, at $100 each,	= $29,000
One-fourth, at 200 each,	= 58,000
One-fourth, at 300 each,	= 87,000
One-fourth, at 300 each,	= 116,000
Annual total,	$290,000

Let the faithless doubt. Let the timid reduce the aggregate one-half; yea, let them reduce it to one-fourth of the sum, and there remains still $72,500, which is more than twice the amount now realized.

It is not too late here, even at the close of a discussion much longer than we supposed at first it would be, to add, that, having justified this idea of Christian alms from Scripture, Christian antiquity, and the Reformation Church, we are yet able to put the seal upon the whole, for us in the Reformed Church, by producing the venerable and undoubted testimony of our own Symbol of faith—the Heidelberg Catechism. Let us hear its reverend voice! "What does God require in the fourth commandment? *Answer.* In the first place: that the ministry of the Gospel, and schools be maintained; and that I, especially on the day of rest, diligently attend church, to learn the Word of God, to use the Holy Sacraments, to call publicly upon the Lord, and *to give Christian alms.*"

Here you feel yourselves at once in a different atmosphere from that which now surrounds the Church. Alms are here *one* thing, one giving, to one object—to the Church, for the general maintenance of all its interests. These alms are to be given *especially on the day of rest;* on which day we are diligently to attend church, in order there to attend to the following things: learn God's Word; hear the sermon; use the Sacraments; call publicly upon the Lord, in prayer and praise; and

give Christian alms. Here all these acts are put together in the same category as acts of worship, to be performed in the church on Sunday. Ursinus, on this question, says: "It has always been the practice of the Church to bestow alms upon the Sabbath day, and to perform acts of charity"—not merely toward the poor around us, but—"toward those who need our help and sympathy."

"If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them!"

Again we say, let the Church restore this true, original, Christian idea of almsgiving. That it has not been done long ago in European Protestant countries is, beyond doubt, to be attributed to the entangling alliance, into which the Church has fallen with the State. In this country, the Church has a free and open field. Nothing better, in this respect, could be desired. Let our Reformed Church, favored with a vigorous theology, a free government, and a solidly-growing practical life, secure to itself the honor of having led off in this holy interest. Should only several Classes, or even only one,—yea, should only a few congregations inaugurate the system, the success would be such, we feel assured, as to demonstrate with powerful effect that, as it is the only truly divine plan, so is it the only one that can crown itself with success and honor. In more ways than we can now think of or describe, would the restoration of this solemn and interesting part of worship, together with its holy ministry of love, when once it should become general among us, make the Reformed Church a power and a glory in the land.

Art. II.—THE ANTICHRIST OF PROTESTANTISM.

BY PROFESSOR E. E. HIGBEE.

Protestantism, in common with the Church of all ages, acknowledges the presence and activity of Satan in the sphere of our human life. Through his seduction at the beginning, man disobeyed the will of God, and subjected himself and the world to the curse; and ever since, in the whole order of the world's life, his destructive agency, combined with the sinful activity of man, has been continued, and is still active. This, we say, the Protestant Church acknowledges without hesitation. Here and there, in the interest of rationalism or under its influence, individual theologians may have doubted or denied this position; yet this must be regarded as virtually in opposition to the reigning thought of the Protestant world itself.

Satan, viewed as personal and thus possessed with intelligence and will, must have some self-determined end, in view of which he works in the world. It is impossible to regard his activity as that of a mere blind power or impulse, unconscious of its exercise and irresponsible. There can be no physical evil without the background of moral evil. A power or impulse, manifesting a disorganizing activity by the force of its own nature or constitution without any self-determination, is no evil. The activity would be in obedience to its own law. If it be alleged that God made it evil, then the supposed evil inherent in it is but transferred to the creative will, and thus becomes a moral evil. Satan has, in that intelligence and will in whose exercise he conditioned himself against God, that which of necessity brings his activity into what may be called the moral world. His activity is self-determined, and has, therefore, its own aim, and concentrates itself continually for the accomplishment of its own purpose.

What is this aim or purpose, which may be said to characterize the whole activity of Satan from beginning to end? It

is to make himself independent of God, and to bring every thing within the sphere of his influence into the same independence and opposition. It it to set the activity of all life in opposition to its own divine idea, that there may be an everlasting discord and lawlessness throughout the finite. As his name seems to imply (*διάβολος—διαβαλλειν*), he seeks to throw every thing crosswise and into self-opposition,—to bring the world into antagonism with itself,—to disintegrate it, and thus set it apart from the Divine, which holds it in being and order. When, therefore, we have a clear conception of the divine idea of the creation, we can at once characterize the activity of Satan and of every sinful will, as continually in opposition to the realization of that idea. Satan is ever the mocking adversary of the whole process through which such realization is being reached, and the malignant traducer of all in whom the process is at all active.

Now in Christ, the divine idea of the world comes to a full self-revelation. In Him, the Word made flesh, we find the very centre of the physical, and moral and supernatural. He is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and ending of the whole world of nature and of grace. In Him, they form one sublime order and unity, the being and continuance and end of which have their source in His self-subsistent life. He is to faith the central, absolute revelation, in which their whole meaning can alone be reached. The activity of Satan, therefore, and of every sinful will, must find its most fundamental characteristic as *Antichristian.* Satan is, in way of emphasis, *the Antichrist.*

It must not be supposed that Satan can act at will in or upon the world. He is himself finite, and hence can neither create a new essence, nor set aside, by any force from without, the reality of the world's life and order, as this is grounded in the Infinite. Still further, his activity in the world is also conditioned by the fact that there is there, in human life, an intelligence and will, which, by creation, are not under his subjection, but possessed with a power and life, which can shut out his presence, and render vain all his opposing efforts. In the beginning, therefore, it was only through an artful seduction, and

not by any arbitrary, superhuman force, that Satan tempted man to a self-determination against God, and, through his fall, found room for his own activity in the order of the world's history. Man's original fall, was Satan's usurpation of lordship in the world. Through the enthralled human, he became the false prince of the world, and thus found such unimpeded ingress into the movement of the world's life, as to disintegrate it, and set it at variance with itself, and hurry it downward, in accordance with his own purpose, to confusion and chaos, and array it at the same time, as thus conditioned, in hostile attitude to every Divine act and presence, which might serve to reintegrate it and carry it onward to its proper completion. Wherever, then, the supernatural, as a direct manifestation of God in act or word, comes into the order of our life to give, as apprehended thereby, direction and strength to its development that it may not end in failure, there we must expect the fullest concentration of Satanic activity. The revelation of the Divine must ever serve as a direct challenge to the whole power and kingdom of evil. It necessitates by its presence, a *crisis*. It rallies at once against itself the whole army of the infernal world, which, linking with itself the captive human, makes its most determined onset and most furious assault. The descending Divine, bringing light into the world's darkness, threatens the very empire of its usurping prince, and, drawing him into combat, unmasks his evil and uncovers the hidden depths of his malignant purposes. In this way, through history and in most intimate connection with the movement of divine revelation, the evil Spirit is continually disclosed and brought, by the necessary conflict, under judgment and condemnation.

In Judaism, we have the presence of the supernatural in the order of our life. There, the divine revelation moves onward in history, opening the way in its progressive unfolding for the full utterance of its meaning in the Incarnation. In Judaism, therefore, in a more profound sense than in Heathenism, we may expect Satan to be active, striving to pervert the whole mystery of the divine economy: and when Judaism reached that great, central epoch of the world, where, in the incarnation of

the Word, the fulfillment of its whole preparatory course was reached, this Satanic activity may be viewed as reaching its culmination. Such, we know from Scripture, was the case. It was perverted *Judaism* that betrayed Jesus with a kiss, that hurried Him to the Cross, that cried in demoniac frenzy, "*crucify him, crucify him,*"—that stimulated at every opportunity, the less malicious, though heathen Roman power, to carry into effect its own murderous intent. The Saviour penetrating at one glance beneath the outward acts and human perversion, saw Satan, in all this, marshalling against him the whole force of the world. The very presence of Christ was a direct challenge to the whole power of Satan, a threatening overthrow of his whole dominion. "For this purpose was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the Devil" (1 John iii. 8). Satan and the sinful world were called of necessity into the field and conflict. No sooner have we the baptism of Jesus, marking the time when, both by inward preparation and outward circumstances, He was ready to publicly manifest His messianic glory, than the Tempter meets and assails Him. In this great and necessary crisis, the Seed of the woman and the Serpent were face to face in an encounter the most real imaginable, and one in whose issue were involved infinite consequences. The evil Spirit is now fully unmasked; and in the steadfast resistance of Christ, by which the very sufferings endured are so many witnesses of the continued, triumphant submission of Jesus to the Divine will, and of his inflexible purpose to complete his glorious work, that Spirit comes under judgment and condemnation. The Apostle Paul, in his epistle to the Colossians, has given utterance to his profound sense of the terrible crisis, when alluding to the victory of the Cross. "And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it" (ii. 15). Christ, having in His own steadfast resistance in every conflict, manifested not merely an innocence of nature, but the higher reality of sinlessness in the real sphere of moral activity, and having carried victoriously in his own person our humanity, through suffering and death and Hades, wresting from the adversary

the keys of his most central dominion, rises from the dead, leading captivity captive, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God, the captain of our salvation, and the leader of many sons to glory. His life, in this most real way, the source and substance of our salvation, now through the Spirit (into whose sphere it really passed in the resurrection and ascension), and in the living organism of the Church, flows over to the children of men, who, in the obedience of faith, become conscious of its sacramental application, and give room for its sanctifying power.

In this view, the Church must be regarded as that constitution of grace, in which, through history, the fullness of Christ is filling all in all. As such, it confronts at once the whole demon force of the world. Against it, as already against Christ in the natural body, Satan bends every effort, seeking at every point to set aside the whole mystery, and render it ineffective in the order of our life. With most peculiar solemnity did the early Christians realize that the Church, as such a supernatural constitution, challenged the whole empire of Satan, and brought it under comdemnation. The Church exorcised demons. She claimed to deliver from Satan's power in her baptism, and to deliver back into his power in her excommunication. She purged the Heathen temples for her service, and, in the most real way conceivable, wrestled against principalities and powers and dominions spiritual. We repeat, then, that against the Church as thus viewed, we must expect the activity of Satan continually to direct itself. In every epoch of the Church's history, in every crisis of her movement in the world, an antichrist is continually unmasked,—an opposing power of evil evoked and brought under judgment. "Little children, it is the last time; and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists" (1 John ii. 18). To St. John, this forms the very evidence that it is the last time; for in every such unmasking of Satanic activity, there is the challenging presence of the supernatural order of grace already passing judgment and hastening, as it were, in such form to come in upon the world in that positive and over-

whelming character which can alone be regarded as an adequate response to that necessary postulate of faith, "*He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.*"

Protestantism, therefore, if involving, as it is claimed, the presence and activity of such a constitution of grace as is made to challenge us in the article of the Creed, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," must expect to find within its own sphere the opposing and perverting activity of Satan. If, in its development, it has a most fundamental principle of Christianity to maintain and carry forward to a full realization in history, we must expect, from what has been said, that it will in this very movement unmask what may be termed its antichrist, and thus make room for his judgment and condemnation. In this connection, it is of great importance practically, and not simply in the interest of speculation, to know what the antichrist of Protestantism is,—to ascertain if possible, what characterizes the antichristian element which strives to pervert and render vain the whole issue of the Protestant Reformation.

It will assist us very much in this inquiry, if we can discover, in the activities of Satan, that method by which he gains entrance into the movements of history, so as to be able, in any measure, to pervert them according to his own purpose. Here, at the outset, we may say that it is not in any outward and arbitrary way that the Devil forces entrance into the world, overthrowing all natural and moral relations, and dragging into his own sphere by supernatural violence the activities of human life. The nature of man at once prevents this. The human cannot, from the beginning, be the passive tool of Satan, or the mere slave of his wanton caprice. Where there is self-consciousness and the power of self-determination, as in man, the very ground of any moral perversion must be in a self-act, no matter what may be the surrounding seduction. The moral nature of man, to be such, must determine itself, and this determination must be its own free act. The necessity of this is involved in the very idea of a created will, which must make a transition by its own activity from the undetermined to the self-determined. If, as created, its determination were fixed by an activity outside

of itself, it would not be will. In this case the sphere of personality would not in reality transcend the lower sphere of nature. The necessity of such self-determination of the finite will, involves the truth that there must be the consciousness of a moral law, in obedience to which the transition may be made, and the will thus find the contents of its own life. In other words, the divine idea of the created will is just this, that it may, by its own activity, inwardly realize the moral law as the norm of its own process, and the contents thus of its own freedom. There must be, therefore, in every such transition above mentioned, the possibility of transgression. Absolute freedom, as in God, involves no such possibility, for there can be here no transition. God is eternally self-determined, and therefore his own law. There can be no obligation resting upon him from without. But relative freedom, as in man, involves the possibility of transgression; for without this possibility the finite will would be in its own nature already determined, or obedience to the law would be a physical necessity inherent in it, and not a moral obligation. Just here, in this possibility of transgression, not itself a sin until in the transition it becomes realized such by a self-determined act against the law, Satan finds a point of attack, in which, hurrying the will to such critical activity, he surrounds it with every possible allurement, to make it by its own determination transgress the Divine will. He covers up the result of such activity, which could be to man at best only an unknown something yet to be, by denying its most revolting feature, and by bringing into view another, "Ye shall be as Gods, knowing good and evil;" and addressing the woman, as by natural constitution the most susceptible in the way of pleasure and desires, he calls into exercise physical and mental appetites (she saw the fruit was good for food, and pleasant to the eye, and also to be desired to make one wise); and thus, as far as possible, and in the very physical and moral relations in which man stood, he strives to condition in his own favor, though in deceptive pretence in man's favor, that self-activity, upon the peculiar direction of which all depended. Here the method of his activity is not that of bold and open opposition to the principle which he

would pervert; but it is a seductive impulsion, so far as possible, of the principle itself into that false development, which he saw was possible. This characterizes, we may say, the method of his whole activity, and at the same time that of the activity of all sinful will.

Man having fallen, and direct Divine revelation having manifested its presence in the order of his life, as in Judaism, to make possible its recovery, its redemption and glorification, we must expect that all sinful activity to pervert this, will be characterized, not by a bold and open opposition, but by a covert and inward perversion of the apprehension of the revelation itself; for in this apprehension only could its own power come to any effective realization. At best, this apprehension could be but fragmentary, and in view of this the revelation was given progressively, in many parts, and directed to the varying conditions of life (*πολυμερως και πολυτροπως*, Hebrews i. 1); and further, this apprehension, in view of man's fallen nature, was subject to one-sidedness, and more easily perverted. Heathenism, therefore, is not the Antichrist of Judaism. The danger, in Judaism, is not from its direct opposition, but from itself. Its own idea,—its own principle, is the very centre where the Satanic perversion will seek to lodge itself. The history of Judaism, at every point, and especially at its great epoch of consummation, most clearly confirms this statement. The first characteristic element of the Divine revelation, was *promise*. In just this element, also, was the great perversion of Judaism. Its promised Messiah became, in the false apprehension of Scribes and Pharisees, a great world-hero, who must overturn, by outward and arbitrary power, the whole existing order of the world, make stones bread, work his ostentatious wonders before the admiring crowds of the Jewish capital, and gather by conquering dominion into his kingdom all the pomp and glory of the world. The promise, as thus fantastically torn from its true moral meaning, one side falsely elevated to the depression and full submergence of the other, was made in the end to array itself against its own contents, when the Tempter used it against the promised One in the wilderness. In one sense, the Messiah was to

be a world-hero. He was to renew the whole moral and physical world, and gather into his kingdom the highest worth and glory of the created. But He was to bruise the serpent's head. He was to *redeem* by the power of a higher and holier, yet suffering life, the whole economy of nature. He was to realize the whole compass of the promise, not by outward prodigies and arbitrary violence, but by an inward, recreative life-process, whose result should be, from this very fact, only the more real and visible. The promise, however, as falsely apprehended by Judaism at large, had come to be a sort of mocking caricature of all this, a sort of inward disruption of its real contents; and, in this character, an accumulated temptation over against the mission of Christ. Another element of Divine revelation, was that of *covenant*. Here there was a special, yet not arbitrary, call of Abram, and the base of a chosen nation and a chosen seed, with privileges and sacramental seals. Its perversion meets us every where, in a mere formal exclusiveness, a narrow bigotry—a sort of ancestral exaltation, without reference to any thing beyond flesh and blood,—a world aristocracy in form, and without moral contents. "*We be Abraham's seed.*" "*Abraham is our father.*" No reference is made at all to his spirit, or to the grace which called him; and linked with this, in the same mere carnal sense, is the assertion, "*We be not born of fornication; we have one Father—God.*" This is a disintegration of the very principle of the covenant, a setting of it at variance all the while with itself, and the Saviour profoundly replies, "*Ye are of your father, the Devil.*" Another element of the Divine revelation, was that of *law*. Its perversion is legalism, a disintegration again of its very principle, a setting of its elements against each other, and against the covenant and promise. The element of covenant has not its sinful antagonism in a bold opposition, in way of denial, but in its own false and perverted exaltation. So the element of law has its perverting evil, not in antinomianism, but in legalism. We repeat, that such seems to be the very law (if we dare use the term), which characterizes Satanic activity, or the method, rather, in which,

through the movements of history, sin is continually unmasked to be brought to judgment.

Protestantism, then, may expect to find its antichristian element not beyond itself, but within itself, and this in the form of a false and perverted exaltation of its own principle,—a disintegration of itself. This perversion, its own movement will unmask from within itself, and, if of any historical force, will bring it to judgment and condemnation. The covertness of the perversion lies in just this, that lodged within the very movement itself, it is continually looked for elsewhere. Protestantism, bent upon discovering Antichrist beyond itself, in Romanism or elsewhere, fails to see him enthroning himself in its own citadel; and the effort to cast out the mote in another's eye, exhausts the strength which should be used to cast out the beam in its own eye.

By the force of history, accumulating through ages, the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century came into being. It was no private theological inquiry on the one hand, nor any mere theory of politics on the other, that caused the movement, or that can be said to characterize it. Its inception was the work of no single mind. It was Teutonic Christendom, impelled by its own inward genius and spirit, and disciplined for ages by the culture and grace of the Christian Church, rising up to assert in behalf of Christian liberty, in Church and State, in politics and theology, and in the whole sphere of moral life, the imperiled rights of the individual. In this direction the German world had been struggling, in the midst of imperialism and feudalism on the one hand, and the papacy and scholastic tradition on the other, for centuries, and found itself at last compelled, either to yield its own consciousness of truth and justice, its own most inward sense of its mission and duty to what it regarded in the very depths of its life an arbitrary and tyrannic authority, or make room for its own progressive activity in organizations more free, and better adapted, inwardly and outwardly, to the demands of its own Christian consciousness. The German world, urged by its developed, and now awakened spirit, which, through long discipline under Christianity, had come to a clearer

apprehension of its own meaning and mission in history, confronted that which would still bind, in an unnecessary and untimely and unnerving tutelage, its free energies; and, having taken its position through a growing and now settled conviction, it was compelled by the very contents of its life,—by its very self-hood, to exclaim, as did one of its great representatives, "*Hier stehe ich, ich kann nicht anders, Gott helfe mir! Amen!*"

Freedom involves, on the one hand, a general authority of law, which must ever assert itself as of real obligation in the sphere of individual life; but it involves, also, on the other hand, the truth of intelligence and will in the subject, through which the authority must come to a moral authentication of itself. There is no freedom in lower nature, where there is no real self,—no personality. There is authority here, and also full obedience to the same. Both we see in the crystalizing sand, the growing plant, and the instinctive animal; but we find no freedom here, in its true sense. The general organic law comes to a concrete utterance of itself in the species and individuals, foreshadowing the reality of freedom, but it is never realized in consciousness as the norm and contents of their life. In man, however, such realization, through self, is reached. Here there is a moral world, a moral nature; and Christianity cannot, for a moment, override this, without, in the end, destroying itself. How can one conceive that the redemption, perfection, and glorification of human life, should involve, at the outset, a transfer of man's distinctively moral nature into a sphere below itself, where the authority of the Divine shall find no inward self-authentication in intelligence and will, but pronounce its imperative *Thou shalt*, to be obeyed as the law of gravity is by matter? Christianity, which, as the absolute revelation of God, is clothed with an authority at all times imperative, is at the same time most sensitive in regard to the sacredness of that moral sphere in which self-consciousness and self-determination are of such fundamental account. In Christianity, indeed, the subject finds his own being perfected, not violated; finds his personality as a thought of God, eternally itself in its fulness; finds himself not bound, but able to bind himself in most free

harmony with the law of his own life. "*If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.*"

We repeat, then, that by firmly maintaining in full harmony with the nature of man and the fundamental principle of Christianity, the claims and rights of the subjective, the individual, because these were felt to be endangered, the Protestant Reformation sought to reach a freedom more real and truly Christian, than it could find surrounding it in the still continued mediæval catholic world. It is not our purpose here to substantiate this by any historical proofs. This we deem unnecessary; for the antichristian elements, unmasked by Protestantism in its positive development, will serve, in a negative way, to confirm what we have assumed.

The principle of Christian liberty asserted on the side of the subjective, against the overbearing arbitrariness of authority, involves at once the possibility of a dangerous perversion in the way of an abrupt breaking with all constituted authority under any form. Here lurks the Antichrist of the whole movement in its incipiency, hiding himself beneath a great and necessary principle, to impel it in its evolution into a self-destructive career. We discover such an antichristian element manifesting itself just so soon as the Protestant Reformation began to assume a determinate historical character. In Carlstadt, Münzer, Nicolas Storch, and his twelve apostles, Johann Strauss, Stübner, and others too numerous to mention, and in the fanatic antinomianism which entered so largely into that great elemental strife, the *Peasants' War*, no one can fail to see the dangerous perversion which threatened the whole interest of the Reformation, and how critical the issue which was involved. It cannot be denied, that all this was greatly stimulated, and brought into such serious activity by the then prevailing influence of that principle of Christian liberty, which was so powerfully asserting itself in behalf of independence throughout the German world. But this is not to the discredit of Protestantism itself; for it was but the unmasking of the evil to bring it to its proper condemnation. Luther, as is well known, had no sympathy with the whole agitation. When drawn out to oppose it, he did not forsake or

compromise his position, but asserted it calmly and steadfastly over against what he rightly perceived to be a mere caricature of it. The whole movement of the Reformation disentangled itself from this dangerous perversion, and went onward in its positive development. It could not, when confronted by the perversion of its own side, swing over to the opposite, but held itself firm to its own stand-point and mission, and in fact, through the perversion itself, though not of it, more fully developed its consciousness of a freedom, in which the subjective side should be emancipated from a servile bondage, which shut out all proper exercise of either intelligence or will, and in which, at the same time, it reached a more settled conviction that such emancipation did not involve the necessary destruction of authority or law. Overcoming the evil, it gained a greater positiveness of principle in the very conflict, and a clearer evidence to itself of the historical force of its own mission.

It would be dangerous, however, to suppose, that, because baffled in this one form, the evil perversion could not, in a more covert, and for that reason, a more dangerous form, again show itself, and strive to accomplish the same result. In the political sphere, we see, even at the present day, continually connecting itself with the Protestant movement, an impulse now towards *agrarianism*, a breaking up of all relations of property in a kind of levelling process, striving to reach a permanent, jubilee year, and now again turned toward social *communism*, a breaking up of all social relations, making the mystery of marriage a mere civil or ceremonial contract, and in the interest of individual rights invading the hallowed oneness of husband and wife, and endeavoring to reconstruct the moral organism of society, by individual aggregations, on the base of congeniality of temperament, discovered, it may be, by phrenological or craniological investigation. The whole aim of the effort is, in reality, to give to every individual the assumed right to construct his own law. The important truth is persistently shut out, that only through what may be denominated objective constitutions of the moral world,—organisms of our human life, does law reveal itself as general, and from God, instead of mere individual willing, and

from man, isolated from all the relations of life; and reveal itself also inwardly in that very reality of personal being where it is self-acknowledged, as not only binding, but as the very sphere in which the will, according to its divine idea, finds the contents of its freedom. The perversion here is just the disintegration of the principle itself,—the refusal to see any possible mediation and union between general law and individual will, and in the interest of the latter the persistent attempt to submerge the former, or to array them both in a necessary and irreconcilable antithesis. This perversion, however, is most dangerous in the form of *pure democracy*, or what we deem equivalent, in the form of a steadily settling conviction, that all authority in the State comes from below, and is the creature of individuals, who, by some mutual compact, consent, through a surrender of certain personal rights, to make the necessary sacrifice for the sake of living together in a body corporate. *This* is the *political Antichrist* of Protestantism, who must come under judgment, or overthrow in the end the very interest which Protestantism would guard, and in proud triumph show himself *Anarchy*, a despot more fatal than the tyrant. Such a conception of government holds in hostile antithesis the two necessary factors of freedom. They are, in fact, arrayed against each other in the very thought, which mechanically unites them, and the side of authority made to yield, though, of course, practically maintained. The surrender of certain personal rights, to gain what is felt to be necessary, viz., a general and secure protection, constitutes, in this view, the ground of the authority of the State. The oak surrenders, or rather, is compelled to limit in its growth the range of its individual characteristics, in order to be regarded as under the control of the genus! There is no interpenetration of the general law and the individual! They stand apart as antagonistic forces, in no organic union in life—the genus a pure abstraction, perchance an accumulated bundle of resemblances, hunted up empirically, and generalized in thought—the individuals the only realities scattered broadcast over the world! The law of vegetable life does not, in its own limitations, utter itself in the concrete organisms of the vegetable world! Such a philo-

sophy, applied to nature, is, in thought, the disintegration of the whole physical world from beginning to end. So in the moral sphere, the State, when viewed as a mere abstraction, a name given to a concentrated grant of powers from individuals, who weaken their own personal completeness by giving a part of what really belongs to it, is the very disintegration of the idea of freedom. The union of the general law and the individual will is, after all, based upon their necessary distinction, and not upon their organic relation. The theory is but individualism in fact, shutting out of view the great truth, that law, as the very form in which the Divine will creates, and preserves, and completes the world, does not remain something abstract, but actually comes into the very order of the world, and mediates itself through concrete forms and organisms of its life, and thus comes in the end to reach the individual will, and there actualize itself as the very home of that will's activity, the very sphere of its freedom. The theory may serve a certain end for a time, in guarding, though under false colors, the independence which a moral nature requires, but sooner or later must manifest itself practically in anarchy, unless brought under condemnation.

Again, in close connection with this, there is a kindred perversion, which continually threatens the Protestant movement in its ecclesiastical character. History, which, as in itself a vast organism, men cannot construct to suit their own individual purposes, and which thus shows itself to be, in a most important sense, an objective presence and authority every where confronting men, and through which also the Divine purpose of the world is reaching out to a full realization,—history in this form may, in the interest of self, and as a mark of individual independence and freedom, be either summarily dispensed with, or come to be viewed as of little practical worth or force. This is nothing more, however, than the perversion already referred to; for the family and the State, with all their necessary and comprehensive social relations, are themselves, as organisms of our moral life, forms of history, essential factors in the development of human life, relative gradational ideas, through which the absolute world-thought of God is realizing itself. But what we

wish to bring into special view here, is, that there is another most central and comprehensive organism in history, a supernatural constitution of grace,—the mystery of the holy, catholic Church, as made to challenge our faith in the Apostles' Creed. It is possible that the Church, as an objective presence of grace in the world, may be set aside in the interest of individual piety, and a mere subjective sense of the natural social spirit in human life organizing, in the interest of religion, forms to suit common subjective religious wants and experiences, take the place of faith in the supernatural mystery itself. Such a perversion meets us, in one form of its manifold manifestations, in the dark side of *Pietism*, in the eighteenth century. Here we have an instinctive hostility to every thing sacramental in the order of grace. Weekly schedules of necessary religious emotions and frames of mind, evince the overriding presence of the subjective. The Church comes more and more to be viewed as but an aggregation of individual religious experiences and plans, and no longer challenges either faith or reverence. Moreover, this movement showed its close alliance to the old, all-levelling fanaticism, which revealed itself in the Peasants' War. We do not mean to say that Pietism itself is to be charged with all the extremes, into which it ran. It served an important practical end in the midst of a narrow, pedantic symbolism. What we mean to say is, that Protestantism, in its movement, unmasked the evil itself in the form mentioned, and also brought it into judgment. We find the perversion, however, still seeking to maintain itself at the present day. It characterizes still, to a large extent, the movement of Methodism. The sacramental is almost entirely excluded here. Sacraments are administered, it is true, but have lost to faith their true significance. Infant baptism is rarely alluded to, and then generally in the way of guarding against giving to it any force. The education of children, as themselves through it in the sphere of grace, is set aside; and the prominent interest, engaging the steward of the mysteries of God, is made to be the conquest of feeling, by anxious bench excitement, and other expedients of kindred character, where faith secures itself in the subjective emotions, with-

out anchoring itself in the reality of Christ's presence in the order of grace, as this is made to confront each and all in the mystery of the Church. Here individual experience rules. The convert *feels* himself to be a Christian, and this *makes* him so, without any reference to baptism, or to any sacrament, or to the Church itself to which he applies himself, however, as to a community, whose society he has proved himself fit to enjoy. Submission to the Church is thus viewed, in most cases, as a mere social requirement, and not the obedience of faith to the very mystery of grace, which is made to challenge it from the heavenly world. This is clearly a perversion of what is generally called the material principle of Protestantism, viz., justification by faith, and a perversion, also, as before, in the way of a disintegration of the principle itself. The objective mysteries of grace, which, in the obedience of faith, are realized as apprehending and being apprehended, are set aside, that the contents of faith may be found in the emotions, and experiences, and religious conditions, or states of the individual. As in philosophy, the theory of absolute idealism can only grasp the relation of object and subject in consciousness by casting out the former, making the external world at best but a visionary projection of self; so here the supernatural world of Christianity can have no place in that faith, where alone it can find conscious lodgment in human life, and must fade from view as a mere abstraction, and in the end the Church and Creed become mere visionary projections of individual religious willing, and thinking, and feeling. The mourners' bench is sacramental, and baptism a mere form. A transition of feeling is that to which the soul is directed under the most forcible stimulants, in place of being confronted with the Creed, as the grand outline of Divine revelation in its living facts, as these have unfolded themselves in the consciousness of Christendom, and are unfolding their meaning and power in history. All this is done in the assumed interest of the Protestant principle, in direct contrast with the whole inward spirit of the Reformation itself, and in a pernicious sundering of what it held together as of fundamental necessity for its own princi-

ple. Luther, Calvin, and even Zuingli, would have at once pronounced it *Antichrist.*

Another form of this antichristian individualism, in its irreverence for history, and its want of faith in the supernatural reality of the Church in history, is discovered under the mask of what is called *Bible Christianity*, where now, again, what is called the *formal* principle of Protestantism, is disintegrated. With the utmost confidence in mere individual tradition (such it may properly be called; for often it extends hardly beyond a generation, if, indeed, beyond some notable sect-leader's own speculations), eighteen centuries are vaulted over, Church, Creed, Theology and all, and the Bible is reached,—the absolute revelation, viewed in this case as a fixed past thing,—a constitutional record, which has never, in the way of life, found any real entrance into history. This record is then separated from the whole mystery of the Church, in whose bosom it had its being, is itself torn apart by either a rationalistic or supranaturalistic exegesis, and every individual or party triumphantly finds his own system and creed, in whose special interest, after all, this wonderful somersault was made to Palestine and the first century.

> "Hic liber est in quo quaeret sua dogmata quisque;
> Invenit, et pariter dogmata quisque sua."

We notice some apparent improvement at the present day in this extravagant, unhistorical procedure. Already, the various denominations, beginning to realize the difficulties which beset them, and to regard with some degree of alarm the outspoken want of confidence in the peculiar traditions, in the bosom of which they have hitherto stood, are moving toward consolidation in the way of natural compromise upon some platform, less broad than the Bible, interpreted by every one at will, and less narrow than some dogma of theological science elevated into a necessary postulate of faith. We find now the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds put forward, no longer regarded, we presume, as fossil relics of a by-gone superstitous age, as they were but a few years since, when the MERCERSBURG REVIEW earnestly di-

rected attention to them,—no longer as little Apostolical as the invention of Christmas pie, according to the profane statement of the Boston "Recorder," only eighteen years ago. But even here, as promising as is the movement in this form, we doubt whether we have not upon us again the same irreverent playing with sacred things. These Creeds may be used as a mere outward sign of copartnership, mere forms, without contents. Are they firmly grasped, in their real historical sense, by this movement? Is there a clear apprehension of the life of the Church, in whose bosom they came into being, and whose inmost consciousness of the mystery of grace they profoundly uttered? Is there an earnest sympathy with that life, as thus apprehended? Will not those who are interested in the movement, attempt an analysis of these Creeds, and reproduce, for the sake of the disunited elements that are seeking union under them, the living relations of history, in which they were a hallowed rallying ground of Christendom? When this is earnestly done, hopes may be entertained that by this movement the danger of individualism may, in one form at least, be guarded against.

What antichrist, as threatening the Protestant movement, and being unmasked by its history, will all this individualism, in its disregard of history and the Church, reach out to? What may be expected from this disintegration of the whole principle of Protestantism in both its material and formal sides? A babel of sects, one springing up after another, will manifest itself, indeed, is manifesting itself. Individual congregations, constructing their own creeds, organizing their own democracies, originating their own ministry on the base of an universal priesthood, and only uniting together in some extra corporation, such as a tract society, a conference, a Bible union, an evangelical alliance, &c., will form a sort of pious parody of what the Creed means by the *Catholic* Church; and in the end, enthroned as God in the midst of this tohu vaa bhohu, Anti-Christ will show himself ecclesiastical Anarchy, more fatal even than the Hildebrandian Papacy.

Can Protestantism, unmasking such an evil, bring it under

condemnation, and fully eliminate it from its own process? Some, despairing of the possibility, have swung over to the opposite pole of Roman Catholicism, and some have fell into a kind of rationalistic infidelity. Protestantism can and must bring its own perversion to judgment, if it be done at all; not, however, by yielding its own fundamental principle, or for a moment compromising its integrity. It must oppose the perversion, by giving proper prominence to that side of the truth, which the perversion is hiding from view, and persistently negating, and thus reach a higher stage in its own positive development, a generation from within of strength and positiveness in the consciousness of its own integrity. ("Der Irrthum tritt, wie die hæresis oder wie die Sünde, an uns heran mit einer falschen Negation und einer falschen Position zugleich, und nur indem wir jener falschen Negation eine wahre Position, dieser falschen Position eine wahre Negation entgegensetzen, heben wir den Irrthum gründlich auf, und der Erfolg jeder gelungenen Polemik is darum eine neue Bekräftigung der Wahrheit durch Vermittelung der Entkräftung des Irrthums, eine neue Behauptung der Ersteren durch Enthauptung des Letzeren." Franz v. Baader.) It must earnestly bring home to itself the idea of the Church, as a supernatural constitution of grace in the world, and array it against the spirit of sect. It must bring into view against prevailing misapprehension, the objective mystery of the sacraments, and array it against false individualism and pietism. It must hold firm the distinctive reality of the ministry, as having its source in the risen and glorified Christ, and perpetuating itself through ordination, and array this against a pernicious ecclesiastical democracy. It must bring the objective in worship into prominence against naked subjective spiritualism, and allow its liturgy to recognize a holy presence and mystery at the altar. But it must, at the same time, maintain with equal firmness the claims of the individual and subjective, as not at all in any essential antagonism with all this. Of course, this work is difficult, and, from the very nature of the case, must be unpopular; for to hold two polar forces together in their proper organic oneness, requires

far more depth of thought and energy of will, than to take either the one or the other in their separateness and mutual antagonism. It is easier to fight the Pope on the opposite side, than to struggle against difficulties continually unfolding themselves from within our own side. It is easier to swing over to Rome and give up, than to wrestle with the problem in faith toward its solution. Already, the earnest effort at least of our own Church to rescue itself from the perversion in such a frank and manly way as has characterized it for the past twenty years, is a matter of ignorant reproach. We are going to Rome; when, on the contrary, we are laying the broad foundation of defence, that Protestantism may be saved from that self-destroying necessity. We are driving every thing headlong in the interest of mere theological speculation; when, on the contrary, we are insisting upon the very postulates of Christian faith, as in the Creed, over-against all vagrant speculation which wantonly casts them aside. We are laboring against the Reformers—the Fathers of our Church; when, we are endeavoring to save from ruinous disintegration the very principle for which they lived and struggled. Some even are charged, and this openly, with foisting in heresies, by turning their own official positions into a kind of smuggling conspiracy against the very Church which stupidly fosters them; when, they are striving to make more plain and intelligible their own position, and urging all to settle, with solemn earnestness, the grounds upon which heresy itself shall be determined. What more positive labor can be conceived of than this? What more practical interests can ever exercise the thought and energy of Christian men and ministers? What better challenge can a Church of the nineteenth century make upon the sympathy and gratitude of the Christian world? Space does not allow us to continue the subject farther, and bring into view the whole movement of rationalism, or to show how each perversion to which we have alluded, when referred to the person of Christ, ends in the same antichrist which, though now under deeper disguise, confronted the Church in her earlier years of heroic conflict and victory.

Art. III.—OUR OPEN DOOR.

BY REV. GEORGE B. RUSSELL, A. M., ALLEGHENY CITY, PA.

We propose to consider some facts, holding in relation to the Reformed Church in America, at the present epoch; and in the use of these, we wish to call attention to such practical reflections, to be drawn therefrom, as may be turned to good account, for ourselves and others.

The Historical Relations of our branch of the Reformed Family to Catholic Christianity, in its present aspect, is a fact of no small moment. The Doctrinal Position of the Church of the Heidelberg Catechism, as holding so marked and distinct, yet, withal, so moderate and firm a self-conscious sense of nearness to the grand Central Truth of Christological Faith, is another fact challenging the earnest attention of theological thinkers. The Confessional Fidelity, moreover, which we have maintained steadily over against all the different extremes in Religion, in Philosophy and in Politics, gives us a character worthy of respect and confidence, which others might be proud now to claim.

We confess here, in the outset, to a warm love for the Reformed Church; this leads to an ardent love for the Church Catholic; and, back of that, is supreme love for our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who is Head over all things to the Church, which is His body—the fullness of Him that filleth all in all. Let not our love, holding first in our particular branch, the Reformed Church, be charged upon us as party feeling or bigotry. While we need not love other branches of the One Holy Catholic Church less, we may be allowed to love our spiritual mother, more. In this, we try to keep "the commandment, with a promise." True self-consciousness is not egotism; and while, therefore, we claim certain characteristics for the Reformed Church, it need not be at the expense of others, or to their disparagement. Bearing this in mind, no exceptions need be taken to the spirit of this article.

From the beginning, the history of the Reformed Church has been peculiar; but during the last quarter of a century, her jealous care for the Name of Jesus, bearing martyr testimony in her confession, and her noble endurance of persecution in keeping the Word of Christ, mark her as a true Church, of a stamp analagous to a primitive type. (Rev. iii. 8–11.)

Christianity is Truth. As truth cannot be destructive of unity, the Holy Catholic Church is One. The formulas of truth are, however manifold; and so there are diversities in Unity; but these do, nevertheless, not destroy the oneness of the Church, which is the body of Christ. In the seven Churches of Asia, we have, therefore, varied Types of the divine truth represented to us, in the revelation of the Spirit speaking to these Seven Churches. Each separate Church is represented as having a Golden Candlestick, as well as a presiding Angel. Yet each has its own characteristics, of prophetic and representative meaning for the things that "shall be hereafter." Without being required to refer the several characteristics of each to the others, we claim the privilege of calling attention to the typal relation of one to the Reformed Church.

A mirror of all ages, must, of course, be able to reflect, also, the special character of any given age. In general similitude, this sevenfold representation refers, we think, to all times and to all lands. Like other scripture, it holds the specific in the general. The seven days of creation and rest, for instance, are followed by seven representative types of men: Adam, or Human Nature; then what comes from this, or his two sons, Cain and Able, showing the Carnal and Spiritual mind; next, follows Noah, or Regeneration, the flood representing baptism, the washing away of pollution and sin; after this, only, and not before it, as some would have it, is Abraham, or the Spirit of Faith; from this is begotten Isaac, or the Spirit of Sonship; the seed of this is Jacob, or the Spirit of Service; and finally, there comes Joseph's suffering and glory.*

If persecutions be a mark of a true Church; and if the

---

* See Jukes, on Types of Genesis.

martyr spirit, that endures hardness in keeping the Word and confessing the Name of Christ, be evidence of even a little strength, in the exercise of divine grace; then may the Reformed Church in this country, rejoice in her unswerving testimony for Him who is head over all things for the sake of His body, which is the Church. For such cause, there is set before her AN OPEN DOOR, to which fact our Lord calls attention. Rightly apprehending this, will also bring others to worship at her altar, learning lessons of heavenly wisdom and obeying the divine Truth.

What right is there, however, for assuming these facts? May not as much and the same, be honestly claimed by other Churches, who are larger, who have more material means, and who make more show in the flesh? Is it not, after all, sheer presumption, for the least of the tribes, to stand in the van of Protestantism, with her living Theology, giving thought, and type, and mould to others, who are wide enough awake to apprehend the situation?

The Reformed Church, however small and insignificant in the eyes of others, may rightfully claim in true humility, what she self-consciously holds as from her adorable Lord. Her relation to other Churches give her "a little strength." Originally formed in obedience to a historical compromise between the extremes of Protestantism, holding a central relation to the truth, as that rests in the broad ground of the Apostles' Creed, the most general norm of Christendom, the Reformed Church became a mediating power between other forces, that have not always been as true as they ought to have been to the Catholic element of ecclesiastical history. In this one fact alone, the Reformed Church has more strength than others, who throw away this vantage ground of power. Standing in this golden mean, there was ability to save herself from wildfire and fanaticism, so rampant, on one extreme, in the years gone by; and also, to refuse to be measured by the dogmatism and presumptuous interference on the part of others, ready to spy out her liberties. Only on the broad, middle ground of well-settled principle and general truth, as that holds in œcumenical faith, does the Reformed Church care to stand.

This, of course, gives offence to both radicalism on the one hand, and to the dignified claims of immobility on the other. And for this cause, the Reformed Church has suffered long; and has borne these sufferings well. This prepared us for the true revival of Church life, through which we were permitted to pass, culminating in the fruit of our Tercentennary Jubilee. It brought us first to a right apprehension of our Catechism; which, at the same time, saved us from the New Measure heresy. The rich inheritance of our fathers led us back, first to the great truths set free in the Reformation, and which join us thus historically to the life of the Church, as that holds from the beginning. Honoring our fathers, and their fathers, in the Christianity of the past, we hold historically the word, the faith, the customs, the festivals, and the sacraments of the Holy Catholic Church. In this, we have been thought peculiar. Nor is it even now a great burden of care to us, to be thought popular, in the common acceptation of that term, just when any extreme modern tendency happens, for the time, to prevail. Extremes, we know, are alway wrong or dangerous; and should any, for the nonce perchance, be in the ascendancy, it can have no charms for the champions of general truth. So, the motto of the old Reformed banner is: *Rather be right than be popular.*

Not to run with the multitude to do evil, is a virtue of great worth. This is especially true in Church history; and the Church that dares maintain the right, in the face of opposition, that steadily withstands the solicitations to fall in with broad-road travellers, that stems the tide of errors setting in upon the truth like a flood, must always be respected.

Settling great questions, freeing fundamental truths, and defining main principles in the light of historical development, was the work of the Reformation age. To the Reformed Church was assigned, by the ordering of divine Providence, whose hand moves in history, the strong middle ground relation to the either extremes of the Church. And true to her pristine type, the Reformed Church lifts up her banner to the world, to-day.

No part of our general Reformed life has been consciously repudiated, or given up—which is more than can be truly said

of many others. Even Romanism, claiming absolute infallibility and immobility, has, meanwhile, defined new dogmas of faith; so that what was not an article of faith, and, therefore, might be held or rejected by a good papist twenty years ago, must now be believed on pain of purgatorial burning. As to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, the Romish Church is not *semper idem.* Others, also, have tergiversated with variations almost *ad infinitum;* or at least fallen away from a firm adherence to their standards; while we still are true to the œcumenical symbol of Protestantism, and rest even more firmly than ever on the Faith of Christendom, the Apostles' Creed.

A good ship, in time of storm, may be rocked by the winds and the waves; but if well built and well manned, it will outride the fury of the gale. So, under storms of opposition, the historical strength of the Reformed Church presents a consistency of testimony, that bitter persecutions, and popular heresies, and spiritual declensions, and galvanic spasms, and warlike controversies could not wear out. The dews of vigorous youth are yet upon her virgin locks—not weakened, hoary age.

If this strength be withal called little—that is, not great in quantity; yet is it in real quality, still, *strength*, if we further consider *the Doctrinal Position of the Reformed Church.*

To have kept Christ's Word, in the hearty teachings of our symbolical formulas contained in the Heidelberg Catechism, while many others gave way to modern errors, is no sign of weakness in the Reformed Church. The doctrinal position thus maintained, is a remarkable and peculiar fact. In the general defection of others from the Reformation sense of their own standards, is the contrast most broad and plain. Even in the present generation, the trial has been painful and protracted. The marked and well-defined position taken by the Reformed Church in the early days of the Reformation, has been most faithfully maintained. If Rationalism was at any one time most alarmingly present in Reformed Theological systems, it was also here that it met its earliest and severest checks, and

suffered its greatest defeats, and received what may be considered its final overthrow. From Schleiermacher onward, Germany bears testimony on this point; and our Church in America has also rendered essential service.

More especially in this country may we speak of the Reformed Theology having maintained its strength, and called forth respect, in its Mercersburg school. After a period of lifeless formalism and inactivity in the last century, the result of influences flowing from European Rationalism, infidelity and the continental wars, it has now, in our age, awakened to new power, and startled the theological mind of America, by a strong and steady re-affirmation of the old Reformed doctrines, in a true historical development.

A truer Philosophy is nowhere to be found, than is held and taught in the institutions of the Reformed Church. A better Theology, in vain is sought for, and probably does not exist, than that system set forth by our standards and maintained by their teachers. Thus heartily and in larger measure, by the Church, is being made known the manifold wisdom of God. At what odds the contest, some years since, was carried on, we all very well know. For awhile it stood: The world against Mercersburg; and Mercersburg against all the world. How goes the contest now, let those say who have been won to an acknowledgment of the truth. Not only has attention been fixed on the great issues, but respect has been won, thought has been challenged, and earnest men have been set to *thinking*.

Central—the most central of all the doctrines taught and maintained, is that of the Incarnation, the Eternal Logos, the Word made flesh. Nowhere else has there been such Christological teaching, at such heavy cost, as by our Church of the Heidelberg Catechism. Christ, the living Word, the Truth, is for our System of Theology, the Alpha and Omega. For our Faith, He is the Beginner and Finisher. For our creed, He is the sum. For our Cultus, He is Vinedresser, Husbandman and Lord. For our Worship, He is the Life, the Way, the End. Church Creed, as the doctrine of Christ, is the Catholic authority on which the faith and obedience of men are chal-

lenged. The objective power of the Word, in the ordinances of the Church, is the ground of this strength.

Divine truth, as doctrine faithfully kept, must forever exclude all mere fiction, or human notion, or fatal diabolical error. Not, however, without contest and fierce opposition, can the positive truth be taught. Hence our Church, while by no means contentious or magisterial, but rather conciliatory and moderate by virtue of her inherent life and *Mittle-mass* position, has nevertheless, been the occasion of most violent theological controversy. We are not, however, the troublers of Israel.

Fanaticism, claiming for itself special *spiritual* piety, in many of the sects, arrayed itself against the teachings and customs of our Reformed fathers. We all know how fierce for awhile was the war. Indeed, the smoke of battle has scarcely yet cleared up, and the din of strife, though apparently dying, is still heard in its surging and receding echoes. Meet a bear robbed of her whelps, rather than contend with the wild spirit of "*piosity*" in fanaticism. Keeping Christ's Word, as against the false spirits, is a work of the Reformed Church has tried to do; and who will say, that in this, there has been no success?

Errors and abuses of Romanism (to which some timid souls thought our school bound to go, body and soul), no less than the wild frenzy of the sects, and Puritanic spectral ghostliness, and Baptistic heresies of our age, all have been confronted by the strong doctrinal position of the Reformed Church. It is not boasting, nor is it too much to say: that the earnest, firm and moderate teachings of her school, during the last quarter of a century, has, under God's guidance, done more towards giving proper tone and healthful direction to the theological thinking of our age in America, than any other one religious body, however large and influential, can honestly claim.

Master minds have been developed for the work among us; and others abroad have been called to the right fountain of Truth. Christology is now working its way into more general and scientific apprehension. It must run through every system and control it at every point. As a consequence, the *Idea of*

the Church is calling for most earnest attention in all the most respectable denominations; and Church History cannot now remain a neglected study in respectable Theological Seminaries. The *Doctrines of the Sacraments* are now coming more and more into honor, where some time ago, all sacramental teachings were thought to smack strongly of popery. *Christian Cultus* and *Worship* in general, now demand revision and real amendment in the Liturgical movements going on even in Churches, where, not long since, *such like* things were entirely unknown. Whatever may be thought of it by others, whether, in their notion, to our credit or shame, it is, nevertheless, a significant fact, that in this, no less than in the developing of a living theology for our age, the Reformed Church has, also, been in the van, in this liturgical work.

Confessional Fidelity in not denying the Name of Jesus, is another element of strength in the Reformed Church.

What a faithful witness (Martyr), has not the Reformed Church been for the Name of Christ! Our most excellent Catechism, the flower and best fruit of the Reformation, has been a standing testimony for that Name. Amid all sorts of defections and declensions elsewhere, this standard has not trailed in the dust. Schisms and heresies, rationalism and pietism, puritanic presumption, and sect piracies, have all alike failed to extort from the Reformed Church a denial of Christ's Name. To witness a good profession is no mean grace. The Church that has power to do this, and does it in confessional fidelity, has a spirit akin to the martyrs.

Bearing this testimony for Jesus, has begotten the true Spirit of the noble army of martyrs; and this freely offered up martyr blood in the cause. In the long ages of the past, the history of the Reformed Church is, in this respect, glorious. Not always in great might, but in real strength, has her witness been given. No less now, than in the days of the fathers, is this martyr spirit a mark of the Church. The power of true faith, always works like results. In will, or in fact, the spirit is the self-same in martyr testimony.

Persecutions have indeed befallen our Church in these latter

days, because we have chosen not to deny His Name, after the fashion of the times. It had been easier for us, doubtless, to have fallen in at every point, with the reigning spirit of American Protestantism; and joined now in the hosannahs to the Son of David, that it one day would sing; and then straightway, only a few days later, demand His crucifixion—when the multitude had been misled by unbelieving scribes and envious Pharisees. Not so would the Reformed Church treat her Lord.

Moderation, fidelity and loving trust forbid our falling in with every hue and cry, that for the moment happens to be the popular hobby. So, our historical relation never joins us to any radical extreme; our doctrinal position does not give way to every new-fangled *ism;* and our confessional life refuses to lose itself in every wave of modern error or false practice among the Babel voices of the land.

Hostility is of course awakened by this fact, and opposition is savagely aroused. The offence of the cross has, therefore, not yet ceased. We are thus called to suffer shame for the Name of Jesus Christ. But we cannot deny His Name, however much it might please others. It is not an easy thing, we know, by no little experience, to be made a gazing stock, on which the whole religious public, as it were, may post up their placards of ridicule, to our shame and reproach. By a sort of common agreement, a conspiracy of this kind was once and again formed to badger the Reformed Church out of her steady faith, and tie her to the tail of the reigning false spirit of the age. It takes a hearty confidence in the faith of Jesus Christ, to meet all this—such an abiding, all-conquering faith as Moses had, who chose rather to suffer reproach and affliction with God's Israel, than to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter.

God will surely reward this confessional fidelity in the Reformed Church; and for what she has patiently endured, there shall be to her a return of double. To be charged before the religious public with wanting vital piety and godliness, because we opposed the fanatical excesses of the Anxious Bench system; to be proclaimed before the Christian world, as on the high road towards Rome, because we hold fast to the grace of

the sacraments, and have faith in the Church; to be called dead formalists, because we are providing our Church with a liturgical order of worship; to be unchurched and unfellowshipped by every modern upstart sect, because we do not glory in their multiplied stripes and shades and colors of party and schism; to be ruled out of evangelical Protestantism by those who outpope the Pope, because we, in self-defence, charge that, the difference between us and them is that they have fallen away from the proper sense of their own standards and the primitive truth; to suffer crusade after crusade and continued piracies, until the world wonders why this burning bush has not been consumed—all this, and much more, has been the blessed lot of the Reformed Church. Count it all joy, ye that suffer thus for the Name of Jesus!

Yet there is perhaps not to-day another Church, which has proportionably, and with such small means, maintained such steady internal and external growth, in the last twenty years. Thanks be unto our Divine Lord for the "little strength" of His grace given unto us, to keep His Word, and not deny His Name! In due time the reaping will come; and for this cause, there is set before our Church an Open Door.

If what we have already said of the characteristics of the Reformed Church be true, then may also the Church hear her Lord calling her attention to the "open door" which He has set before her, because of her works in keeping His Word and bearing testimony to His dear Name. For this cause, He will "make others know that He hath loved" her; and therefore shall they come and worship at her altar. The open door will be for the Church to go in and take possession of the nations; and they shall come and join their lot with her, for the Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel.

Looking, then, at the historical relation of the Reformed Church to the other branches of the Church catholic; and considering the doctrinal stand-point of our faith, so broadly resting on the Creed of Christendom; and consciously maintaining our confessional life in the most central ground of Christianity, we cannot but hear our Lord challenging the Church to duty,

in view of the *open door.* He hath set it before her. It is opened by His divine providence and grace. No *man* can shut it. The opportunity He affords, none can take from her.

To America, God hath given largely to hold the destiny of the world at this time in her hands. History is declaring this land to be the battle-ground of future contests for the rights of man, and the triumphs of the faith. Who knows but for such a time as this, He may have brought the Reformed Church to her present position? Whatever He may have committed to others, there is at least no limit to the open door of opportunity He hath here set before us. Mark well that interesting fact! Would to God, we acted on it aright!

No other Church has a broader historical character, as a basis for enlarged operations and conservative influence. There is much in this fact alone, that fits us to meet the present necessities of our great land. It is very certain that no other body can do all the work needed in this land of the future. It is doubtful whether all others combined could, without our aid, do the work on hand at the present time. Romanism, for instance, with all its high claims, cannot reach the broadest and deepest wants of our progressive nation—for the Papacy knows nothing of progress. It is true, they are trying to ride into favor now, because, as a Church, they have abstained from the political issues of the late war. But this is not an honest claim. The only representatives of their Church, when they have no councils in session, are their bishops; and we know what part these took in the North and in the South. No other Church was deeper in the muddy pool of politics. Their late General Council shows them to be alive to a sense of their calling.

Episcopacy, inheriting much from the personal character of Henry the Eighth and his period, has not the scope and stretch to compass the far-reaching wants, so crying in their demands for relief in our age. Lutheranism, with all its great worth and Reformation characteristics, so excellent and fundamental, may yet come to find that no one personality of the reformers, though it have borne the name of the chiefest, has all the results of Protestant truth. They are surely our help-fellows in the Lord,

and they are fighting like battles. Puritanism, with its contracted and narrow constitution, can never claim to satisfy the whole country; since it is even losing ground in its own early home, and is running to bad seed in other parts of the land. Presbyterianism, however respectable, has not yet become Catholic enough to hormonize its various schools. It may yet come to a higher conception of its calling. Methodism, notwithstanding its imposing numerical strength, must either change its system even more than it has already done, or be re-absorbed by some more churchly element. The Baptistic sects must either crack their exclusive hard and soft shells, or disintegrate still more into splits and factions. All the "No Creed" Churches will soon become the no Church party, and go over bodily to blank infidelity.

Divergencies and dispersions cannot solve the problem of the world's wants. There must be a bond of union, a ground of agreement, a faith held in one, a unity of life principle, if the Church of Christ is to exert its true salt-savoring power, and be the light of the world. Where can all come together on a better ground, than in the Creed, as that flows from the Person of Christ, the God-man? Whoever stands nearest to this life-power, is least removed from Catholic unity. If the Reformed Church has the Apostle John's place near the heart of her Lord, He may answer first her questions, while the others may be no less anxious to ask theirs.

In the present great NISUS of our American church life, after higher truth in Catholic Christianity, there is much to hope for, as we firmly believe, in favor of our humble calling. So little removed from central Catholicity in our history and life; so moderate, firm, irenical, œcumenical, and sound in our symbol of doctrinal faith; so steady and consistent in our confessional trust, we may with confidence bear our testimony to the whole country. To challenge attention to our history and creed, is to command respect for that which is greater in this view, than numerical strength, and better than outward material wealth. There is nothing in our history, life, confession, and customs, either schismatic or provincial. There is that in this Catholi-

city alone, which should carry the conservative teachings of our Reformed Church into all parts of this great land and the world. And we have reason to believe, that when once rightly known, we might expect obedience to the faith on every hand. The great want now is positive faith, a real Christianity for the whole man, body and spirit. The Church of the Future, whatever that may be, will doubtless be found making large account of the elements now at hand in our Reformed Church.

Wherever the Anglo-Germanic life and spirit prevails, there especially is *an open door* for us. The millions of our kindred in the rapidly-growing West, should at once be properly provided for by the Reformed Church. So, all the large centres of population, and the great thoroughfares of trade, need our immediate and earnest attention. The territories soon to be made states; and the broad prairies and teeming valleys towards the setting sun, all these show us the wide "OPEN DOOR."

Before the end of the present century, there will most likely be great changes wrought in our social and national fabric. The immediate future of America, will probably give tone, in the immediate coming ages, to much of our subsequent history. In all this, the element of TRUE RELIGION and SOUND PHILOSOPHY, will necessarily bear no unimportant part. The reconstructed country will differ as much from what it is at present, as it now does from what it formerly was. Its wants must be met by faith and pure religion undefiled before God. Nothing less will meet the case, and that system which has it to give, will be freely drawn upon to meet the necessity.

Already it seems pretty well settled that New England cannot so enlarge its selfish, social, and political ideas, as to be either the law-maker, or the law-holder, of this whole great nation. Neither can the Theology of the witch-burners, satisfy the deep-felt wants of the inquiring religious spirit of the age. Material Philosophy and ghostly Religion cannot hear the soul-cravings of a mighty and intensely earnest people.

Puritanism is fundamentally unchurchly and mechanical, with a materialistic tendency. It is, however, only the true idea of the Church of Christ, with all its real contents, for Christian

Faith, that can satisfy the gnawing hunger of the present, and hush the soul-cryings for that which is to come. When party strife has spent its force, either in politics or religion, there must come a power to take up the jarring elements, and harmonize them, in a principle broader, deeper, higher, and truer than mere partizans possess. The divine-human, the God-man, the Church, is the power to do this; and this precisely is *the need* of the present hour.

Mingling now as never before the great breaking up, through which our country has just been called to pass, the spirits of the Alps and of the Rhine, of the Glens and of the Moors, all unite with the peculiar life of America; forming a broad and new nationality, reaching far beyond the narrow provincialism of Cape Cod, wiping out Mason and Dixon's line, and knowing no east, no north, no south, and no west. He is an enemy to his country as well as to the Church, who would now stir up, increase, or minister to the continuance of party strife, factions, sect, or schism.

Religion cannot be less Catholic than the universal life of our *polygenous* nationality. Hence that system, which is not bound by the narrow limits of old traditions, nor embarrassed by unwise legislation, nor trammelled by false prejudices; but is free to carry the whole blessed gospel, with all its gracious benefits, to all parts of our land, and to all its people,—that system has, in so far, most certainly an open door set before it. What Church can, with so little embarrassment and so much conscious freedom as ours, offer the blessings of CHRISTIANITY to our whole country? To the fullest extent of our means, and to the utmost measure of our ability, may we enter into this open door.

Others of the Churches have each their several excellencies, from which we would not in the least detract. They each, also, have their work to do in their own way. And therefore, while we are not excluded from any place, nor confined to any class of people—for the door is open absolutely without limit as to this—yet are we painfully conscious that we cannot, even if we would, do all that is to be done. We cannot, and desire not, to

exclude other Churches, nor do their divinely-allotted work. Nay, it is exceedingly doubtful whether we will do all *our* work; rather is it almost morally certain that, with all our advantages, we will fail to accomplish fully *all*, to the doing of which, we are so solemnly called. Self-conscious of our duty, we presume not to stand in the calling of others. For though no man can shut to us the open door, yet God can. He opens, and no man shuts; He shuts, and no man can open. Our failure, therefore, to enter at the proper time, the open door of opportunity, so graciously and with such marked distinction set before us, may soon bar it for ever against us. The probation time may not be long. "Behold! I come quickly," is the admonition. "Hold fast that thou hast," implies also the dread possibility of letting it slip.

Much has already been lost—lost beyond recovery. First, we have not known the day of merciful visitation. Even now, when self-consciously alive to the call, our means are limited, and that which we have, is not all available for this great work, as it should be. The wealth of the Church has not been surrendered to the Lord. How little finds its way into His treasury! For the sheer want of means, the great privilege of entering into the open door, must largely be foregone, and that, perhaps for us, forever!

Had we, additional to our present force, *five hundred faithful men, of proper qualifications*, they might all find mission fields of great promise, in as short a time as they could be commissioned and sent. But laborers, men, fit men, are greatly needed. The harvest, indeed, is plenteous, but the laborers are few. Who will consecrate their children and themselves to the service of the Lord? Who will hear His call to enter into His vineyard and work, with the blessed assurance that whatever is right, He will pay? Self-consecration is needed on a larger scale than ever before, if the Reformed Church is to go in at this open door. The land ought to be possessed, and there is much yet to be occupied. Who will go up in the name of the Lord? Shall the Canaanite remain?

The crisis of the nation is upon us; and there ought to be gospel truth and grace enough to light up the dark future way

of the people. There ought to be enough gracious salt to preserve the nation from threatened corruption. There ought to be enough Christological Faith to save men. Souls are in perishing need of salvation in Christ by the saving powers lodged in His Church. The Church that most really brings these means within the reach of men, will be acknowledged as the most deserving of confidence. Faithfully keeping and administering the Word and Sacraments, as the means of grace, is the duty of the Church. And to this calling the Reformed Church, from her positive stand-point, has faithfully addressed herself, to the negative exclusion of much else, that has claimed the attention of others. For this cause our Lord will "make them of the synagogue of Satan" come and worship at our altar. If we improve our high and holy privileges, He will make others know that He hath loved us.

See to it, that no man take thy crown! Watchfully, is that crown to be kept and guarded. The open door of unlimited usefulness, is a goodly jewel in the crown. The way to do good lies all about us. This gem may be made to shine in the crown of our eternal rejoicings. That God has given us the "little strength" we have, is, indeed, a marvel. Our ability to testify above others of the tribes, to the truth as it is in Jesus, is a grace we may not innocently forfeit. "To him that hath, shall be given; and to him that hath not, shall be taken away even that he hath." In the faithful use of strength, we retain what we have, and grow yet stronger; but failing to use our powers, is the surest road to utter weakness. Ability to hold a commanding position in Church History, to mediate and reconcile extremes, to afford a central base for freer and broader final union, to point to the only ground plan of Catholicity, and to co-operate in the furnishing with others the historical elements of the Church of the future; to teach pure Doctrine, hold a Catholic Creed, and confess a Christological Faith; having an œcumenical catechism, being a true Church, and furnishing real grace in the word and sacraments, is a blessed gift, and no mean mission in any age, to any land.

Here may others learn that God honors them that honor

Him. Fidelity to His name has its own reward. A martyr crown is a crown of life. Testimony for Jesus is better than mere worldly influence, numerical strength, or popular favor. All they that live godly shall doubtless suffer persecution—but be of good cheer—for our Lord has overcome the world. Him that overcometh, will He make a pillar in God's temple, and he shall go no more out, but will wear the new Name.

Rationalism and infidelity on the one hand, and blind submission and Romanism, on the other—these have formerly been generally thought to be the only alternatives for earnest men. But there is a better way. A true faith, a real Church, sacramental means of grace, and an order of worship in which the Divine and the human can come into full and free union and harmony, is found in the Reformed Church. There are those now in her holy communion, who can bear witness to her power to save them from both the Scylla *and* Charybdis.

All the grace of salvation is in the Church. It is, then, of the first importance to be *in the Church*, in order to partake of this grace. Only *in the Ark*, is safety from the deluge. Because the Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel, it shall be that whatsoever good thing He shall do unto us, shall be also theirs who go with us. The Way, the Truth, and the Life, is by the "open door." By Him, if any man will enter in, he shall be *saved*.

He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches!

Art. IV.—THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA.

FAITH—GOVERNMENT—WORSHIP.

BY PROF. E. V. GERHART, D.D., FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA.

In the history of the German branch of the Reformed Church in America, we may distinguish *four* periods, each one of which is marked by some characteristics peculiar to itself. The present status of the Church in respect to doctrines, and particularly the earnest effort to establish an Order of Worship more in harmony with the genius of the Gospel, and better adapted to the needs of the clergy and laity, are most intimately connected with the moral forces at work in her history, and can be duly appreciated only when studied in the light of the changes wrought by these forces during the past hundred and fifty years.

FIRST PERIOD.

The *first* period commences with the beginning of the emigration to America, from the Palatinate and France, of persecuted Protestants of the Reformed faith, and their settlement in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia and the Carolinas, and extends to the year 1747, when the first Synod, or Cœtus, as it was then called, was convened, through the instrumentality of the Rev. Michael Schlatter, in Philadelphia; a period that covers from twenty-five to thirty years, during which the Germans—generally poor, dwelling in small log houses in a wild and inhospitable region, destitute of the comforts and frequently of the necessaries of life, and continually exposed to danger from roaming savages—were scattered abroad like sheep without a shepherd over a wide extent of uncultivated territory, along the rivers and creeks, in the valleys and among the mountains, and living, for the most part, without schools and churches, without teachers and ministers, and in consequence without the Sacraments

and public worship. Children grew up unbaptized. The youth were not catechized and confirmed. The people in general, received no moral and Christian instruction. In times of misfortune and sickness and sore bereavement, their sorrow was not relieved by the sanctifying ministrations of the Church, and often not by the sympathy of relatives and friends. Copies of the Bible, catechism, hymn-book and prayer-book were scarce. Nor could they have been purchased in America, even if they would have had the means. The sense of destitution and isolation was intensified by difference of nationality, language and social customs, which separated them from the society of English settlers, and rendered free social intercourse impossible. It was still more intensified by the immense distance at which the people were removed from the mother country—far greater then, relatively, when the steam-engine and steam-vessels were unknown, than now; an exchange of letters consuming rarely less than six months, and often as much as nine months or a year.

The unavoidable consequence of such dispersion, isolation, poverty and religious destitution in the new world, it is not difficult to imagine. The state of the Church was chaotic. The material was abundant; but there was no organization. While the more earnest and faithful did not cease to long and pray for the means of grace, many became indifferent and careless. An entire generation grew up without any instruction other than what was given by parents. There was no defense against error and sin. Fanatics and errorists, of which, according to the best historical data, there were not a few, had free access to the people. Left to themselves, some were drawn aside from the faith of their fathers. Vicious practices and customs gradually came into vogue. Downward tendencies work toward their corresponding results much more rapidly than upward tendencies. Hence when, in 1846, Schlatter arrived in this country, he found the religion and moral condition of the people of the Reformed faith to be both very lamentable and dangerous. The strongest language could scarcely express fully his deep sense of their spiritual needs.

Ignorance begets prejudice; and political oppression, jealousy of personal rights. Having escaped from virulent persecution in the fatherland, and suddenly transferred to those colonies of America which enjoyed extraordinary civil and religious liberty, the great change exposed the people to new dangers of an opposite character—the danger of mistaking self-will for freedom, the legitimate authority of Church and State for tyranny, and the maintenance of ecclesiastical order for an infringement of their civil rights. To what extent these evils obtained a foothold, it is not important to determine. But that they existed, is known from the events of the time and the developments of a later period. Take as an example, the disorderly and revolutionary proceedings of the Steiner party against the noble Schlatter, 1749, in the (Race street) German Reformed Church of Philadelphia.

Some of the evils which took root in this moral chaos, have perpetuated themselves down to the present time. Indeed, this first lamentable period in the history of the Reformed Confession in America, seems to typify at least one side of her ecclesiastical life and condition through all subsequent periods. Spiritual destitution, the want of ministers, large pastoral charges, neglect of ecclesiastical order, a separatistic or schismatic tendency, a false jealousy of civil rights and indifference to education, are evils against which the Church has had to contend no less in the present than in the last century.

SECOND PERIOD.

The *second* period dates from the organization of the Cœtus, and continues to the year 1793; and may be called the formative period. During this period of forty-six years, the Church stood in organic connection with the Synods of North and South Holland. These Synods commissioned the Rev. Michael Schlatter, of St. Gall, Switzerland, to go to the American colonies, visit the destitute and helpless Germans of the Reformed faith, preach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments, organize the people at suitable points into congregations, settle ministers, and consummate the work by the organization of the Cœtus, which formidable task he performed with apostolic self-denial

and zeal; and succeeded beyond expectation, in the face of the most formidable obstacles, in bringing some degree of beauty and order out of the original mass. Through his agency, a deeper and more general interest in the American Church was awakened in Holland, Germany, and Switzerland. A large sum of money was collected; a fund established; hundreds of Bibles were purchased and transmitted; appropriations made for the support of ministers, ministers' widows, and schoolmasters, and, in some cases, for defraying the travelling expenses of ministers and elders to the annual meeting of Cœtus. All acts of Cœtus were submitted, for approval and confirmation, to the Synods of Holland, or, rather, to the Classis of Amsterdam, which, by appointment of the Synods, was entrusted with the oversight and care of the German churches in America. The German Reformed Cœtus was subordinate to the Classis of Amsterdam, and, through it, to the Synods of Holland; it had no independent jurisdiction; but was the organ by which the Synods governed, provided for, and managed the affairs of the German Church in America. Receiving such generous support, brought into a state of organization, and held under efficient government, the German Reformed Church struck its roots deeper into American soil, and began to grow. But its growth was very slow. In 1747, there were *five* ordained ministers and *forty-six* organized churches. In 1752, Cœtus consisted of *twelve* ministers; yet, in 1793, when the subordinate relation to Holland was dissolved, Cœtus had on its roll the names of only *twenty-two* ordained ministers. What was the number of congregations, we have no data by which to determine; but we are safe, we think, in estimating them at not less than *one hundred and fifty.*

These *forty-six* years constituted the period of pupilage. The ruling mind was in Holland; or if not in Holland, as the Synods of Holland were rather the medium, through which the churches of Switzerland, the Palatinate, and Western Germany furnished educated ministers and pecuniary support, it was at least foreign. It was not in America, but on the continent of Europe. All the ministers had received an European education. Their

faith and theology answered to the type which was then prevailing in the Universities and Reformed Churches of Germany. The social life of the people reflected German manners and customs; and a new accession of emigrants from year to year in large numbers, served to perpetuate the peculiar character of German life through succeeding generations. The Reformed Church of Pennsylvania, as to government, theology, cultus, morality, and social life in general, was born and grew up in the image of the fatherland.

What the type of theology was in the Protestant Church of Germany in the eighteenth century, and particularly in the latter half of it, it is not difficult to determine. To employ a general form of expression, we may say, that the leading theological tendency of the age was a reaction against a false and lifeless supranaturalism, guided by feeling and the reflections of the natural understanding. The faith of the Reformation as held in the schools and in cultivated and intelligent circles, had deteriorated into a traditional belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures and the historical facts of Christianity, and into violent contention for the confessional standards of the Reformation. Living faith in Christ, sustained by profound thought, and attested by the fruits of charity and holy living, was generally wanting. A cold, stiff orthodoxy, received by tradition from the fathers, co-existed with worldliness and loose manners.

The reaction was twofold: on the one hand, in the sphere of feeling, against the prevailing coldness and neglect of the duties of practical religion; on the other, in the sphere of reflection, against a narrow, mechanical, and unscientific faith; though both tendencies, being affiliated in principle, worked together towards the bringing about of the same general result. The one was Pietism, the other Rationalism. Pietism, springing from a false view of religious feeling, laid undue stress on peculiar kinds of inward experience and mental frames, and was therefore indifferent to the theological formulas of Christian doctrine, as taught in the confessional books, and hostile to the cold and censorious spirit in which these formulas were vindicated by the orthodox schools. The chief interest, according to this

view, was deep conviction of sin, intense sorrow, and a certain violent revolution of feeling, wrought by the Spirit. Whether a man receives all the formal statements of Christian doctrine contained in books written by uninspired men, is a matter, if not of little, yet of much less importance. Of such one-sided religious sentimentality, the natural consequence was a tendency towards uncharitableness and an unsound faith.

Rationalism, like Pietism, began in the bosom of the Church. It asserted the violated rights of the human understanding against the representatives of a rigid faith, who required unthinking submission to all the dogmas of the Church. The learned Semler* discovered, as he supposed, many discrepancies, historical errors, and local popular notions, that can have no foundation in truth, in the Scriptures, particularly of the Old Testament. The age was ripe for such enlightened views. Others were soon drawn into the path of cold, superficial criticism. Fundamental dogmas were attacked, and found to be inconsistent with man's reason and judgment; which, it was assumed, constitute the touchstone by which religious views and theories are to be tried. Christianity, regarded as the best form of natural religion, was resolved into morality and sentiment—just and upright conduct, a tender sympathy with God as revealed in nature, and benevolence. Rationalism, whilst it derided the cant and artificial seriousness of the Pietistic school, was thus in principle allied to its sentimentalism; just as Pietism, whilst it abhorred the worldliness and levity of the Rationalistic school, was, by its aversion to cold orthodoxy and indifference to theological formulas, drawn into the same current of fallacious reflection. Both unwittingly joined hands, though laboring to accomplish opposite ends. Each system included important truth, and could justify itself relatively to an existing evil; but each was ruled by a false principle. Of both the tendency was to undermine the foundations of the faith and churchliness of the great Reformation. The result was an overwhelming flood of error and sin, that swept away the landmarks of the Church, and engulphed the masses of the people in sensualism.

* Born 1725, died 1791.

The destruction was, indeed, not universal. Christ was in the midst of the burning bush. The Holy Ghost did not forsake His Church. The life of godliness did not die out among all the people; nor was child-like faith banished from all the pulpits; nor was the voice of truth silent in every theological chair. An earnest protest was heard from learned and godly men. Influential associations were organized at different places, for the purpose of resisting the progress of neology, and rescuing the ancient faith from total subversion. But the resistance was in great measure ineffectual; because the educated men who defended the truth, were themselves under the power of the reigning method of thought and the spirit of the age. They had drifted away from the status of the Protestant Church in the sixteenth century, but had no clear perception of the fact. They stood in the element of reflection, rather than in the element of faith; being governed more by the judgments of the understanding than by the intuitions of the reason. Christianity was mainly a system of morals, or, at most, of doctrine; not a new creation in Christ Jesus. It is correct, therefore, to affirm that, during the latter half of the eighteenth and the first decades of the present century, a false theological and religious tendency in the twofold form of Rationalism and Pietism characterized the entire thinking and life of the Protestant Church, Lutheran and Reformed, on the continent of Europe.

Of the truth of this general statement, history furnishes ample proof. But it does not comport with the design and limits of this article to go into the details of an historical argument. We may presume that no one will be disposed to deny it, who is acquainted with the tone of philosophy and theology, the condition of the Church, the state of morals, and the political convulsions and revolutions of that age.

In the bosom of these predominant tendencies, were born, bred, and educated, the men who established, organized, and gave character to the German Reformed Church in America one hundred years ago. The records demonstrate that they belonged to the best class, the majority of them at least, of Reformed ministers in Switzerland and Germany. Learned, ortho-

dox, pious, self-denying and faithful, they left their homes for the new world beyond the wide waste of waters, and devoted themselves, amid many privations and trials, with much zeal to the service of the Church, among the scattered and destitute Germans; and they deserve, as they receive, the gratitude, respect, and veneration of posterity. Yet neither gratitude nor reverence requires us to shut our eyes to the undeniable fact, that they were not, in the proper sense of the word, the true exponents of the mature faith of the Reformed Church of the Palatinate, as it stood in the middle of the sixteenth century. Born from the womb of the age, its theological virus circulated in the arteries of their theology, exegesis, and practical religious life.

Few men are endowed with sufficient power to rise above and take a step in advance of the character and spirit of the times in which they live, whether in politics, theology, or social life; and those few are men of genius, who, like the breaking-in of the morning light, rather indicate and foretell, than teach and represent, the new sun of truth full-orbed, while the shadows of the receding night still linger and mingle with the bright beams of coming glory. They are inspired with a new idea, and introduce a new tendency or moral force; but nurtured on the bosom of another and different order of thought, they betray its limiting and modifying influence. They bear a double character. In breaking away from the element by which they were moulded, they carry with them the marks of its formative power; while the new idea becomes the animating principle of a different and opposite element, which idea, like a seed, germinates and grows, but does not bring out its type perfectly in ripe fruit before the eye. The more mature development into system of the new idea, and of its manifold relations, is the inheritance of the succeeding generation. These gifted men are turning-points in history. They constitute an epoch, like Socrates and Augustine; like Luther, Calvin, and Des Cartes; or, as directly related to the period in hand, like Schleiermacher and Neander. The full import of the epoch comes to view in the period which they have inaugurated.

The American fathers of the German Reformed Church did not belong to this class of rare men. They did not rise above and break away from the prevailing theological tendencies. No one started a new current of theological thought. They protested, indeed, against the heresies and blasphemies of rationalism, and against the irregularities and fanatical spirit of pietism; but they did not renounce consciously the idea, or system, which characterized and pervaded the thinking of the age. They did not, by falling back upon the general status of the Reformation as upon the virtue of another principle, introduce a new idea, or system of thought, at variance with, and in opposition to, the one in which they were brought up and educated. Of such disruption, history knows nothing. On the contrary, the American fathers were in full sympathy with the theological animus of the Reformed Church of Europe, as is shown by facts, by the records of the Synods of Holland, by the records of Cœtus, by their sermons and books, and by the works of contemporaneous authors. In all the historical documents which are accessible, there is no trace whatever to be found of an issue ever raised during the last century by the Reformed ministers in America against the Reformed Church of Europe on a question concerning theology or worship. The only logical inference which can be drawn, is what we have stated to be the leading characteristic of this period, namely, that as the Pennsylvania Cœtus stood under the supervision and direction of the Classis of Amsterdam, so the Church was a living continuation of the Reformed Church of Germany, and perpetuated the theology and practical life of the seventeenth century in the new world.

THIRD PERIOD.

In 1792, the proceedings of the Cœtus were, for the last time, transmitted, for revision and approval, to the Classis of Amsterdam. The same year, a Committee was appointed "to prepare fundamental rules" for the government of the Church, consisting of "Domines, Pomp and Blumer." The year following, at the annual meeting held in Philadelphia, Cœtus resolved, "that, for the present, inasmuch as we have not yet re-

ceived a reply to our last letters and proceedings, we will transmit to our Fathers in Holland only a letter, but not our proceedings." At the same meeting, the Constitution, or system of "fundamental rules," was submitted and adopted, which bears the following title: Synodal-Ordnung des hochdeutschen Reformirten Synods und der mit ihr verbundenen Gemeinden in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-America. By the adoption of the *Synodal-Ordnung*, the *Cœtus* became the *Synod*, and the *Reformirte Kirche* became the *Hoch-deutsche Reformirte Kirche*. The Church hitherto known as the Reformed Church, now assumed the title of High-German Reformed, by way of distinction from the *nieder-deutsche*, or Low-German or Low-Dutch Church. From this time on, 1793, the German branch of the Reformed Church in America, ceased to stand under the supervision of the Church of Holland, and became an independent body, governed by its own laws and rules, and sustained from its own resources.

The event introduces a period of history which extends to the spring of 1825, when a Theological Seminary was established. During these *thirty-two* years, the Church was in a condition which it is not easy to characterize. In one respect, there was progress. The people increased in numbers and wealth. There were, also, large accessions to the population by immigration. Congregations multiplied, particularly in Pennsylvania; also, in Maryland and Virginia. Many Germans migrated westward, and churches were organized in Ohio. There was also, proportionally, a larger accession to the ranks of the ministry. While, during forty-six years, from 1747 to 1793, the number rose from five to *twenty-two*, during the succeeding thirty-two years, it rose from twenty-two to *eighty-two*.

But in another respect, there was no progress. There was retrogression. So long as the Church stood directly under the supervision of Holland, the great majority of ministers were thoroughly educated men. They possessed the advantage of training in the Gymnasiums and Universities of Europe. When this supervision ceased, while some men of thorough education

still came from Europe and joined the ranks of the ministry, the larger number came from the membership of the American Church; and as Synod had no Theological Seminary, no College, and no Academy or Classical School, these candidates for the sacred office could acquire only a superficial, or at most, but a partial knowledge of the classic languages, science, and theology. Young men had to prosecute their studies under the tuition and direction of pastors, who had charge of from two to eight congregations. The natural consequence was, that the standard of ministerial qualifications had to be lowered. With the gradual loss of broad culture, departed also, in a great degree at least, the sense of its value. Some of the leading ministers saw the evils to which the Church was exposed from this tendency, and endeavored to resist it manfully, but without avail. At the first meeting of Synod, after the adoption of the *Synodal-Ordnung,* in 1794, it was proposed, "that no one shall be received into our connection, who has not the requisite knowledge of the languages, theology, and moral philosophy;" but the consideration of the proposition was postponed until the next annual meeting. At the next meeting, the question came up again and was discussed; but the record says: "Nothing was done in the matter." The proposition was not adopted. The Synod felt it to be impracticable to maintain the ordinary standard of theological scholarship.

With the depression of the ministry, came disorders, the fruit of tendencies that were working in the Church, with more or less power, from the time of its organization. Laymen presumed to administer the Sacraments; that is, some men arose who arrogated the right to perform the functions of a minister of the Gospel without license or ordination. Disorder manifested itself also among ministers themselves. Some were disposed to set men apart to the holy office on their own judgment and authority as individuals, without the authority and sanction of Synod. This disorderly tendency gave rise to the following action, taken in 1794.

"1. That every one, without exception, who has undertaken, before he has received ordination from our Synod, or from some

other ministerial body, to administer the Sacraments, shall be forever excluded from our Synod.

"2. That no individual member of our Synod shall have the power to ordain others to the ministry, without the consent of the whole Synod. Should, however, any one undertake to do this, he shall necessarily be excluded from our Synod, as an enemy to our discipline."

That the disorders implied by the adoption of these resolutions really existed, appears from subsequent acts of Synod. In 1801, it was resolved "that Mr. Aurandt be permitted to present himself at the next meeting of Synod for examination, and that he be directed, in the meantime, to abstain from administering the Holy Sacraments, and attending on the so-called *Big Meetings*, and to prosecute his studies under the direction of a minister in connection with the Synod." Before granting him this privilege, Mr. Aurandt appeared before a Committee, and manifested great sorrow for violating the order of the Church.

In 1806, the Rev. Mr. Weber, of Pittsburg, in a letter to Synod, complained of a certain man, named *Pfriemer*, who endeavored to make the congregation in that place believe, that he was an ordained minister of the German Reformed Church, because, as appears from the proceedings, he had been set apart to the holy office by the act of an individual member of Synod; when a resolution was passed unanimously, that Mr. Weber be furnished with the answer, having the seal of Synod attached: "That this man, not only has not been ordained by Synod, but also, that this Synod pronounces his ordination, performed by one individual member of Synod, to be null and void." These and similar proceedings reveal the fact, that false views of the Church, of the ministry, and of ordination, had obtained a foothold, during the latter part of the last century, and were working out their legitimate results.

The Rationalistic thinking of Germany was producing ripe fruit, both in the fatherland and in America, in the denial of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and of some, if not all, of the fundamental facts of Christianity. The infidel publica-

tions of England and America increased the dangers of the Church. Synod observed these ruinous elements of thought, and tried to stem the tide. At the meeting held in 1796, "Rev. Dr. Hendel presented the sad consequences, which are caused by the publication of blasphemous works, especially those of Thomas Paine. It was resolved, that the ministry endeavor to operate against these results by watching and prayer, according to the example of the Apostles." The same wakeful and earnest defender of the faith called attention, during the sessions of the same Synod, "to the proposition in the House of Representatives, threatening the overthrow of the instruction of youth in the true Christian religion, and proposed to take into consideration how it may be defeated, or amended." Not having the requisite documents at hand, we are unable to determine the precise character of the "proposition." Nor is it important. This action of the Church brings to light the antichristian influences which were at work among the people.

In 1802, Synod took direct action in regard to the progress and encroachments of Rationalism. The minutes contain this record: "Inasmuch as the attention of Synod was called to the prevalence of Neology, especially in Europe, it was resolved, that with a view to guard against this corruption as far as practicable, all ministers coming from Europe, as well as those ordained in this country, shall hereafter, for a period of three years, be merely honorary members, and shall only, after the expiration of this period, and in case their life and doctrine harmonize with the Gospel, be permitted to vote. This action is to be understood as applying to the *ministerial meetings." The new rule now established, and continued in a modified form down to the present time, must not be confounded with another rule of the Synod, which required licentiates to sustain a probation of three years before they could receive ordination; for the new rule embraces, not licentiates, but ordained ministers. In order to guard, as much as possible, against the "corrup-

* "Ministerial meetings" were meetings of *Ministers* exclusively, Elders not being admitted, as provided by section 9 of the Synodal Ordnung.

tion" of Rationalism, it appears, accordingly, that a man possessing approved qualifications, was required to sustain a probation of not less than *six* years, before he could be admitted to all the rights and privileges of an ordained minister of the Gospel. Two things are evident from these regulations. These measures, whatever we may think of their wisdom or efficiency, indicate, on the one hand, the prevalence of rationalistic sentiments, both at home and abroad; and, on the other, a deep sense of the danger to which the faith of the Church was exposed.

Though these efforts to resist the progress of Rationalism and preserve the integrity of the Christian faith, imply the contrary, yet the history of the times proves, that the ministers of this, no less than those of the preceding period, themselves occupied a *false theological attitude*, whether judged by the doctrines of the Reformation, or by the theory and practice of the Reformed Church of the present day—an attitude, which was the consequence, as we have had occasion to remark before, of a general drifting away of the Protestant Church from the theology of the Reformers. The American Fathers brought with them the Heidelberg Catechism; and we may presume, though there is no sufficient evidence of the fact, that they acknowledged it as the authoritative formulary of faith, in accordance with which they felt themselves bound to preach and catechize the youth. But this sense of obligation was, at most, very vague and indefinite, as is evident from the records of the Pennsylvania Cœtus, from the Synodal Ordnung, and from the proceedings of Synod. There is no reference or allusion of any kind to the Heidelberg Catechism in any of the Cœtal records. It is more remarkable still, that the Heidelberg Catechism is not named in the Synodal Ordnung of 1793, the first Constitution of the German Reformed Church in America. The ministry is not bound to teach according to any formulary of faith, not even the Apostles' Creed. The Constitution only requires, in general terms, that they understand thoroughly, and teach faithfully, the truths of our holy religion, or the Gospel plan of salvation, as held by the Reformed Church; as appears particularly from section 10, which treats of the qualifications of those who intend to devote

themselves to the work of the ministry, and desire to be examined and ordained. The first two articles of section 10 pertain to faith and Christian character, and run as follows:*

"ART. 1. Such persons must have been instructed in the truths of religion, confirmed, and admitted to the holy communion, before they may preach a sermon, or apply for examination.

"ART. 2. In the examination, inquiry is to be made whether they possess a clear and thorough knowledge of the Gospel plan of salvation, and such views of the doctrines of our Church as are sound and conformable to the acknowledging of the truth, which is after godliness; and no less, also, whether they are acquainted with the duties of Christianity, and with the necessity, as well as usefulness of the exercises of godliness."

By the phrase, "necessity, as well as usefulness of the exercises of godliness" (Nothwendigkeit und Nutzbarkeit der Uebungen der Gottseligkeit), the article means, we presume, that candidates for the ministry are to know, from personal experience, the necessity, value, and importance of the exercises of private devotion.

The words: "doctrines of our Church," or, as the original might be translated, "faith of our Church," (Glaubenslehren unserer Kirche), may be designed to embrace a reference to the Heidelberg Catechism; but there is no evidence of such design. The state of theology and the practice of the times, rather es-

* We give these articles in the original German:

§ 10.

Eigenschaften derjenigen, die sich dem Lehramte widmen, examinirt und ordinirt werden wollen.

ART. 1. Solche muessen in den Wahrheiten unserer Religion unterwiesen, confirmirt und zum Genusz des heiligen Abendmahls zugelassen werden, ehe sie einen Kanzelvortrag halten, oder sich zu einem Examen melden.

ART. 2. Bey der Pruefung soll untersucht werden, ob sie eine deutliche und gruendliche Erkenntnisz der evangelischen Heilsordnung, gesunden und mit der Lehre der Wahrheit, die da ist nach der Gottseligkeit, uebereinstimmende Begriffe von den Glaubenslehren unserer Kirche haben, wie auch nicht weniger mit den Pflichten des Christenthums, der Nothwendigkeit und Nutzbarkeit der Uebungen der Gottseligkeit bekannt sind.

Than the tenor of these articles, there is nothing more positive and definite in the Synodal Ordnung.

tablish the probability that the language means the doctrines, in general, of the Reformed in distinction from those of the Lutheran Church. Besides, the "faith" of the Reformed Church was not to be regulative. It was subordinated to something else. The article requires that the views of the candidate concerning Reformed doctrines, are to harmonize with "the truth which is after godliness"—an expression that is based on 1 Tim. vi. 3, or Tit. i. 1, or on both. But what "the truth which is after godliness" is, the Synodal Ordnung does not state. The standard of theological belief was, therefore, vague and indefinite; and could have been nothing more than the general conception of the economy of divine grace, or of the plan of salvation, as then prevailing in the Reformed Church.

This remarkable silence of the Synodal Ordnung in regard to the Heidelberg Catechism, cannot be explained on the assumption that the Catechism was so cordially received, so firmly held, so universally taught to the exclusion of every other, and that there was so little danger of heresy or error invading the Church, that any mention of a Confession of Faith was altogether superfluous. For the facts already cited, support a judgment of a directly opposite nature. The silence can be explained only on the ground, that the Church did not lay special stress on any particular formulary of faith; that the ministers did not hold the Heidelberg Catechism exclusively to be of binding authority, and did not use it in the catechetical class to the exclusion of others. The truth is, that sixty years ago, the Reformed Church in America did not prefer the Heidleberg Catechism to others, in the catechization of the youth, but preferred others to it, and used them in preference. Hence the indifference and silence of the Synodal Ordnung.

For twenty-one years after the Synodal Ordnung was adopted, the same silence prevails in the records of Synod. There is no reference or allusion to the Heidelberg Catechism anywhere. We meet the first reference in the Minutes of the Synod of 1815. A question in regard to "the congregations in the Valley and at Foxhall," New Jersey, had arisen the year previous, between Synod and the Presbytery of New Brunswick.

According to the statement of the Rev. Mr. Wack, Sr., the Presbyterians had "enticed away from us several of our congregations." Whereupon, a remonstrance was sent to the Presbytery. A reply having been received at this meeting, 1815, Synod passed a resolution, which concludes by saying, that it expects "that the Presbytery will permit Mr. Castner to connect himself with this Synod, and that the congregations will be served without departing from the order of our Church, and especially from the instruction of the youth in the doctrine of the Reformed Church, according to the Heidelberg Catechism used in our churches." Here is the first* acknowledgment on record of the Heidelberg Catechism as the doctrinal standard of the German Reformed Synod, and the first allusion to its use in the churches. Still, it is not altogether certain that even this action refers to the proper Heidelberg Catechism; for a book entitled, "An Extract from the Heidelberg Catechism," frequently went by the name which the Catechism proper bears.

It is this so called *Extract from the Heidelberg Catechism*, which was generally used by the American Fathers during the latter part of the last, and during the first twenty or thirty years of the present century, in the place of the Heidelberg Catechism proper. The history of it is not clearly known. By general consent, however, it dates back at least to the middle of the last century, and was prepared by way of accommodation to the rationalistic theology of Germany, which was then at its tide and striving to set aside the old Catechisms of the

* Prior to this time, there is only one reference to a Catechism in the records of Synod. It occurs in 1793, the same year in which the Synodal Ordnung was adopted. We quote the entire passage: "Inasmuch as it appeared to all the members of the present Coetus to be necessary, that improvements should be made in a Hymn-book which is to be used in all our churches and congregations, the following persons were appointed a Committee to attend to this duty, viz., Dominies Hendel, Helffrich, Blumer, Wagner, Pauli and Mann. At the same time, Dominie Winckhaus promised to do something towards effecting a convenient arrangement of the Catechism, and also to distribute it among the members of Synod." As it is not presumable that Synod contemplated any change or modification of the Heidelberg Catechism, the inference is that "a convenient arrangement of the Catechism," refers to some other book which was used in its stead.

Reformed and Lutheran Churches. Many of the questions and answers employ language which is drawn from the Heidelberg Catechism; and sometimes the entire answer is taken from it, word for word. But the book is of an entirely different character. Not only is the order, in which Christian truths are stated different, but the theory of Christianity which underlies and gives tone to the entire book, is contrary to that of the Heidelberg Catechism. While the Heidelberg Catechism, assuming the baptized catechumen to be in the covenant of grace, proceeds throughout on the idea of faith in the person and work of Christ, conformably to the status and spirit of the Apostles' Creed, the *Extract* consists of an arrangement by the understanding of the doctrines revealed in the Word of God, and proceeds on the principle that the knowledge and practice of the duties of religion, is the only way of obtaining deliverance from the misery of sin, and of attaining to everlasting happiness. Possibly it does not inculcate a single proposition that in itself is erroneous. But the book fails to teach what it ought to teach, judging it from the stand-point of the Reformation. The chief defect, however, lies in its ruling idea, which is at variance throughout with the old theology of the German Reformed Church, and gives a relative position, a peculiar force and meaning, to doctrines and duties, which is not answerable to what is demanded by the faith of the Apostles' Creed.

From the information in our possession, we think there is room for the opinion, that one or more other Catechisms were also in use during the time of which we are writing, equally at variance with the genius of the Heidelberg Catechism; but for want of sufficient evidence, we do not affirm it as a fact.* One thing, however, is incontrovertible. The Heidelberg Catechism was *not* the book commonly used by ministers in catechetical

---

* Since this paragraph was written, we have learned from the Rev. Dr. Samuel R. Fisher, who is well posted on the subject, and is, therefore, good authority, that there were *several* different Catechisms in common use among the ministers, to the general exclusion of the Heidelberg Catechism. In some instances, a minister would make his own Catechism, and without authority from Synod, adopt it as the book of instruction for the catechetical class.

instruction; but either the aforesaid *Extract* or some other book. The Hendels, Gobrechts, Beckers, Pomps, Helffrichs, Wacks, Rahausers, Helffensteins, and a long list of others,* practically set aside the proper Catechism of the Reformed Church, and substituted another in its place—a practice, too, which, though becoming less extensive from year to year, has been perpetuated, in some sections, down almost to the present day;† so that as late as thirty years ago, there were thousands of communicant members who did not know what the proper Heidelberg Catechism was, and had never seen it—an undeniable fact which illustrates how far the American Fathers, notwithstanding their self-denying zeal and conscientious opposition to Neology, had unconsciously drifted away from the ancient moorings.

During the second decade of the present century, a reaction set in against the prevailing latitudinarianism, and in favor of a more rigid adherence to the original faith of the Reformed Church, as embodied in its great œcumenical Catechism—a reaction that coincides with the profound and triumphant reaction against rationalism and infidelity in Germany, illustrating again the sympathy of the Church of the new world, in theology and practical religion, with the Church of the fatherland. As the defection in Germany from the faith of the Reformation during the last century was reflected by indifference to the Heidelberg Catechism in the Reformed Church in America, so

---

* Some of these ministers were very active subsequently, in restoring the Heidelberg Catechism to its proper place and authority.

The Rev. Isaac Gerhart, a student of the Rev. Dr. Samuel Helffenstein, who was licensed in 1814, and died two years ago at the age of seventy-seven, is known to have stated, that he did not use the Heidelberg Catechism during the first six or seven years of his ministry, but the so-called *Extract;* because, that being the general custom, he, without reflection, fell in with the prevailing practice of the older and more influential ministers.

† Two years ago, when a certain Classis required one of its ministers to abandon the *Extract,* and enjoined on him the exclusive use of the proper Heidelberg Catechism, a middle-aged elder of the Church, became greatly incensed at the action, because, having been taught the *Extract* in his youth, and having held it as the truth during his whole life, his faith, as he viewed the action, was now condemned as false; and at once demanded a certificate of dismission from the Reformed Church.

now the deep sense of the evils of a destructive criticism and unsound theology, and the earnest inquiry after and scientific vindication of the old faith, which awoke and began to prevail in the Protestant Church of Europe, was reflected, among the German Reformed of America, by a quickening of the old dormant life, and in consequence also, by a revival of interest in the proper confessional standard of the Reformed Church.

But the result of the reaction does not come to view in positive form before the year 1820; when the Maryland Classis passed a resolution recommending to Synod to decide whether the Heidelberg Catechism should not be the only book used in the instruction of youth and in the catechetical class; and also to prepare an abstract of the Catechism, in short questions and answers, and publish it in the English language as an appendix. Whereupon Synod resolved, 1. That the Heidelberg Catechism only shall be used; 2. That a Committee, consisting of the Rev. Messrs. S. Helffenstein, Hendel, Reily, Mayer and Becker be appointed to prepare a brief and suitable abstract of the Heidelberg Catechism, and publish it in the German and English languages, to be used in such cases where circumstances do not permit an exposition of the entire Heidelberg Catechism.

Here we have the first formal sanction of the Heidelberg Catechism in the history of the German Reformed Church of America, as the book of instruction for the young to the exclusion of all others that had for many years been in vogue.* It was restored to its proper place and its original authority. Yet many ministers, disregarding the injunction of Synod, adhered to the old custom. The unauthorized Catechisms could not at once be set aside. The restoration of the Heidelberg Catechism to the confidence and affection of the people, was the

* There is, however, a distinct recognition of the Heidelberg Catechism, as the symbolical book of the Church, in the revised Constitution adopted the year previous, 1819. It is enacted that Synod shall have power to make such regulations as are in accordance with the Word of God, "and do not conflict with the doctrines of the Heidelberg Catechism and Synodical Ordinances." But ministers are not required to teach the Heidelberg Catechism, nor forbidden to teach any other, in the catechetical class.

work of time. It is only during the last twenty years, that its superlative claims have come to be generally felt and acknowledged; yet it is questionable even now, whether it has been introduced into every pastoral charge. For we know that not many years ago, other catechisms still took precedence in some of the Reformed congregations of Pennsylvania.

Not only, however, as has thus been shown, was the doctrinal position of the American Fathers at fault, but *their views of Church order* were also radically different, in some respects, from those which prevail universally at the present time. With them, the ordination of a minister did not invest him with authority to administer the Holy Sacraments. The authority was conferred by a vote of the Synod licensing him to preach the Gospel. A licentiate was at once invested with power to perform all the functions of a minister of Christ. He differed, so far as we can ascertain, from an ordained minister only in two things: the authority of a licentiate could be revoked, for good reason, without a trial, at the end of three years, or at the end of one year; and he was not entitled to a seat and a vote in the Ministerium. In these respects, an ordained minister possessed superior rights. He was a full member of Synod and of the Ministerium, enjoying all its rights and privileges; and he could be removed from office only by deposition, after regular trial before his peers.

Evidence of this practice is found in the Synodal Ordnung and in all the proceedings of Synod until the year 1828. An amendment to the Constitution was adopted at the meeting of Synod, held at York on the 12th of May, 1800, which runs thus: "In order to prevent, in future, the numerous disorders prevailing," as the preamble says, "the following arrangement is to be observed in the reception of persons who apply for admission to the ministry; namely, of those who have not pursued a course of study."

"Our Synod shall consist of ordained ministers, licentiates, and catechists.

"As regards ordained ministers, there shall be no change in the Constitution of Synod.

"Licentiates, after previous examination, receive permission to perform all *actus ministeriales;* they are placed under the special oversight of a neighboring minister, of whom it is their duty to take counsel in doubtful cases; and are required to attend every meeting of Synod, accompanied by their deputies, and provided with good testimonials from their congregations, as also to submit a sermon, written out in full, on the text assigned. In the sessions of Synod, they take a seat next after the ordained ministers, and have a vote, together with their deputies, on all matters pertaining to the government of the Church; their license, however, is to be renewed every year.

"The catechists, after previous examination, receive permission to preach in those congregations to which they are assigned, to catechise, and prepare young people for confirmation. They are placed under the special oversight of the neighboring minister, of whom it is their duty to take counsel in all doubtful cases. Said neighboring minister visits them every year once or several times, baptizes the children, confirms the youth instructed by the catechists, and administers the Holy Communion. They have no seat nor vote in Synod; but attend every meeting of Synod, accompanied by their deputies, and provided with proper testimonials from their congregations. At every meeting, they are required also to submit a sermon, written out in full, on the text assigned. Every year, their certificates of license are renewed. Neither licentiates nor catechists are allowed to leave the congregations assigned them, without the knowledge of Synod. It is their duty also to keep a diary, in which they are to record the performance of official duties, and present the same at every meeting of Synod."

The reason for this arrangement is given in the preamble. Synod desired to maintain a high standard of qualification for the ministry, and yet, in some regular way, to provide the preaching of the Gospel and other means of grace, for the numerous destitute congregations, by means of men who were not qualified for the permanent office of an ordained minister. Hence a licentiate was authorized temporarily, that is, for

one year at a time, or more commonly, for three years, to preach the Gospel, to catechise, confirm, and administer Holy Baptism and the Holy Communion; and entitled to a seat and vote in Synod, but not in the Ministerium, a body composed of ordained ministers only; while a catechist had authority only to preach and to catechise—a position equivalent to that of a licentiate under the Constitution of 1828 and 1846.*

That this practice was actually in vogue after 1800, appears from the proceedings of every meeting of Synod. In some cases, a licentiate was continued in that position as long as *six* years before his attainments and the trial of his character were deemed sufficient to justify ordination, during the whole of which time he served from four to six or more congregations, and performed all the official acts of an ordained minister. The effect of ordination was simply to confirm him in the office with which he had previously been invested by the passing of a resolution and the issue of a certificate; and to give him a seat and a vote in the Ministerium.

Licentiates continued to hold this position in the Church for many years. In the course of time, however, higher views began to prevail concerning the nature of ordination; and the order was abolished by the adoption of a new constitution in1828.†

---

* We have no means of determining positively, whether a licentiate exercised the authority of an ordained minister prior to the year 1800. The Synodal Ordnung, as adopted in 1793, is silent on the subject. The presumption, however, is that he did. For, if a true view of the nature of ordination had obtained during the latter half of the last century, and the practice of the Church had been uniform, it is not probable that so great and radical a change of church order could suddenly have been introduced, and that unanimously in 1800; and by learned men, too, who always manifest so strong and earnest a purpose to maintain the dignity and authority of their office. The chief design of the amendment seems to be, not to invest licentiates with authority which they had not before, but to establish a new class of teachers called catechists, to draw a line of distinction clearly between licentiates and catechists, and to place both classes of persons under the supervision of ordained ministers. Yet we admit the action taken six years earlier, in 1794 (which we have already quoted), to prevent the arrogance of unordained men, implies that, at that time, no licentiate was allowed to administer the Sacraments.

† The practice was not abolished by the revision of 1819, the main purpose of which was to subdivide the Church into districts, authorize the organization of Classes, define their powers and their relation to Synod. Synod expressly reserved to itself the right to license candidates, and ordain them to the ministry.

Reverence and affection for the Fathers did not prevent Synod from setting aside their time-honored custom as unscriptural and wrong. A new order was introduced, and yet not new; for it was simply the restoration of a principle taught in the Scriptures, and governing the primitive Church. Not only new, but also so radically different, that if a licentiate would now arrogate the rights with which the office was formally invested sixty-seven years ago, he would be universally condemned, and punished by a unanimous vote of any Classis in the Church.

As regards the customary *form of worship*, we can gather no information from the records. According to tradition, the Palatinate Liturgy was generally used; but in a modified form. There is no evidence that the American Fathers ever used the office for worship on the Lord's day, which office* includes confession, and a two-fold declaration, one announcing the forgiveness of sins to the penitent, and the other condemnation to the impenitent. Parts of the office—the forms of prayer—may have been used; but not the entire form of service. The prevailing custom, so far as we can now ascertain, embraced the following particulars. The minister, having taken his place at the altar, began by saying, as the congregation arose: In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. Then he announced two or three stanzas of a hymn; afterwards, he offered a free prayer at the altar, concluding with the Lord's Prayer; or, as was more commonly the case, retired from the altar while the last stanza was being sung, and offered prayer on the pulpit; then another stanza was sung; or, omitting this, he passed immediately without singing to the sermon, the people, according to a general custom, rising when the text was read. The form of concluding worship after the sermon, differed very little from that which obtains generally at the present time. From this order, there were some unimportant variations. The Lord's Prayer was sometimes connected with the prayer succeeding the sermon. The first prayer

---

Vid. Mercersburg Review, Vol. II., pp. 270, 271.

may have been offered by some ministers from the Liturgy; but this was the exception to the rule. Liturgical prayers were commonly confined to the administration of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, to the rite of confirmation, the solemnization of marriage, and other special offices; but there is no evidence that these special offices were administered without using the Liturgy, as was so frequently the case twenty and thirty years ago. In the administration of these offices, the Liturgy was always used.

The last century was marked by general defection. As the views of the Reformers concerning doctrine and the ministry were superseded, so were their views concerning a becoming form of worship. The same spirit that practically set aside the Heidelberg Catechism in favor of books of instruction that had no authority, and ignored the necessity of ordination for transmitting the powers and functions of the divine office of the ministry, also ruled out, both in Germany and America, the office for regular service on the Lord's day contained in the Palatinate Liturgy. It need not, therefore, excite surprise, that the American Fathers did not use this office; but should be regarded rather as a consequence of the predominant tendencies of the age.

In regard to the *state of religion and morals*, the records are more explicit. There were but feeble indications of vital godliness and active piety. From 1791 to 1819, we find a uniform report, given in few words, to the effect, that "outward peace and harmony prevail in the churches, and that the office which proclaims reconciliation, is not without fruit and profit." This is quoted from the minutes of 1793. In 1800, the minutes say: "In an external point of view, the condition of the congregations appears to be encouraging;" in 1809: "For the most part, peace and prosperity characterize the different congregations;" in 1812: "The reports were unanimous in presenting the external and internal condition of the congregations in a favorable light." More definite than this nothing appears until 1820. In 1824, only three of the eight Classes, into which the Church was divided, made brief and indefinite references to the

state of religion. The rest were entirely silent. In 1825, the report says: "Concerning the state of religion your Committee have the pleasure to observe, that peace and concord are maintained in the different congregations, which outwardly appear to grow and increase as the Church extends. In some districts, indeed, sin and vice prevail, in others coldness, and yet in others there is too great an adherence to the externals of religion, without an endeavor to experience and enliven the power of godliness; generally, there is reason to complain of the want of zeal, of a disposition to read, and of fervor in religion."

Yet, from 1817 on, a change is perceptible. There is a waking up from slumber. As it was impossible to maintain an ordinary standard of classical and theological scholarship for the ministry, and as the number of vacant churches, for want of ministers of even common attainments, increased from year to year, so that in 1824 more than one-fourth of all the churches reported had no pastors nor regular supplies, the *necessity* of a school for the education of ministers became so clear and imperative, that earnest efforts to establish a Theological Seminary were begun, and continued amid formidable difficulties for seven years, until, finally, the movement culminated in the opening of a Seminary at Carlisle, by the Rev. Lewis Mayer, D. D., Professor of Theology, in April, 1825. Several ministers made exploring tours in the Western States, and as far southward as North and South Carolina, foremost among whom were the Rev. James R. Reily, and the Rev. John Rudy. Their reports revealed extensive spiritual destitution and the urgent wants of the Church, and contributed not a little towards arousing both ministers and people to a deep sense of the necessity of a Seminary.

FOURTH PERIOD.

The establishment of a Theological Seminary is an event of so much significance in relation to the theology, discipline, customs, and the very life of the German branch of the Reformed Church, that it constitutes an epoch in her history, and we may add, the most important epoch. Calling into existence, soon after, a High School, which subsequently became Marshall Col-

lege, these literary and theological institutions introduced a conflict with Rationalism, Pietism, and Sectism, the results of which have elevated the condition, ennobled the character, and quickened the original life of the Church. This great theological and religious awakening has been the means of restoring to the Church its excellent symbol of faith, not only in name and form, but in spirit and truth; of reviving a Scriptural and churchly idea of ordination and of the Christian ministry; of infusing new vigor into its ancient cultus; and introducing a mode of worship more conformable to the practice of the Reformers and the Apostles.

But as this article has already exceeded its intended limits, we will not enter into a consideration of the general characteristics of this last period of ecclesiastical history. There are several facts, however, that deserve to be distinctly noticed, by way of

CONCLUSION.

The entire history of the German Reformed Church in America, from its chaotic state, through the second* and third† periods, is characterized by deterioration. The ignorance and immense spiritual destitution of the people, the great disproportion between educated ministers and the number of organized congregations, the unavoidable introduction into the ministry of men from the rationalistic institutions of Germany, the want of a Classical or Theological School for *seventy-eight* years after the organization of the Pennsylvania Cœtus, the practical renunciation of the Heidelberg Catechism in favor of irresponsible books of instruction, and the false constitution of the ministry; all these indicate a dormant spiritual life, a vague, defective theology, and moral weakness—a state of the Church, than which, taken as a whole, none other, in any previous period of her history, deserves less to be made a standard of judgment for posterity, or an example for imitation. An intelligent contemplation of her condition can awaken, on the one hand, only pain and regret, and on the other, gratitude to God for His preserving care amid such threatening dangers.

* 1747 to 1792. † 1793 to 1825.

This view has been the prevailing one for the last forty years. In no important case have these antecedent periods been regarded as a criterion of judgment. On the contrary, their distinctive peculiarities have been virtually, if not formally, condemned. The Heidelberg Catechism has been restored; and the use of other books in the catechetical class, formally prohibited. Nor was the custom of the American Fathers urged as an argument, or if urged, it did not prevail in favor of a continued practical renunciation of the ancient symbol of the Reformed faith. This radical change was introduced, though it involves a condemnation and repudiation of an established custom.

A change no less radical, pertains to the constitution of the ministry. The law enacted by the American Fathers, in virtue of which, after previous examination, certain men, not ordained, were authorized, for three, and even six years, to perform all the functions of the ministry, has been abolished, as involving, to say the least, very serious error. The abolition by the Classes and Synod was not intended as an act of disrespect to the Fathers; yet it implies that the law was held to be contrary to the Scriptures, and therefore wrong. And where is the minister of the German Reformed Church, who does not concur in the judgment? Who would now argue in favor of reviving the law, because the Fathers enacted it unanimously, and observed it for many years? So clear and decided is the general judgment against the practice, that some may even feel prompted to question the fact of its existence.

Other changes have been adopted, but we will not enter into details. These are the most important.

The deterioration of the Church, resulting from prevailing rationalistic and pietistic tendencies, affected the order of worship, no less than the catechism and the ministry. In regard to the catechism, the evil has been removed; so, too, in regard to the ministry. But the defects in worship are still perpetuated. These defects, it is the design of the present liturgical movement to remedy by the introduction of an Order of Worship warranted by the practice of the primitive Church, and by the practice of the Reformed Church of the sixteenth cen-

tury. The remedy necessarily involves a change. That is its purpose. It is intended by the highest judicatories of the Church to be a departure from the customs of the American Fathers. In no other way, can the Church be consistent with herself. During the last forty years, the Synod has proceeded on the principle, that their customs are not the proper standard of judgment. Just as the Synod, relatively to the Heidelberg Catechism and to ordination, set aside their customs as being wrong and dangerous, so now, proceeding in the same spirit, is the effort made to improve and elevate public worship without regard to those customs. Hence, the argument against the Revised Liturgy, on the ground that it proposes to change the customary mode of worship, can have no logical force. The legitimate force of the argument looks in the opposite direction. If the American Fathers had departed so far from the stand-point of the Reformation, that it was necessary to set aside their Catechisms and their theory of the ministry, it is presumable that their mode of worship has no claim to be regarded as a pattern for future generations.

Art. V.—MAN AND THE COSMOS.

BY PROF. THEODORE APPEL, A. M.,
Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

The Plurality of Worlds: with an Introduction, by Edward Hitchcock, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

More Worlds than One: the Creed of the Philosopher, and the Hope of the Christian. By Sir David Brewster. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1856.

The solution of the question proposed requires that we should first consider the question of the *inhabitability* of the heavenly bodies; or, as it is now more generally styled, the *Plurality of Worlds*. Before we can properly understand what man is, or the position which he occupies in the domain of creation, it is necessary that we should gain some well-established views in regard to this point, and to make something like a survey of the entire system to which he belongs. The subject is interesting and attractive in itself; but it may be readily perceived that it goes beyond that, and affords material for the most earnest reflection and meditation upon man and his destiny. A few years ago it was extensively discussed in the leading Reviews of this country, to a great extent as a matter of feeling or mere curiosity, but not in such a way as to place it in a strictly scientific and philosophical point of view, or to show its religious and theological bearings.

Some of the ancients, who might be considered the prophets of science, surmised that our own was not the only inhabited world; and that the inhabitants of distant spheres, though much purer than we, were in some mysterious way allied to us. They arrived at this conclusion, not on the ground of what we would consider a sufficient scientific reason, but because they were endowed with high intuitional powers; and what they could not see with their eyes, they embraced by a species of natural faith. In modern times, when astronomy has made such vast strides in

the progress of discovery, and worlds upon worlds of immense magnitude, apparently without limit, have been brought to our knowledge, their inhabitability has no longer admitted of any doubt: without opposition it has become an established opinion throughout the religious and scientific world, entered our literature, and mingled itself with our religious convictions. Dr. Chalmers acquired much of his fame, by embodying it in his well-known "Astronomical Discourses;" whilst the popular writer, Dr. Dick, has given a special charm to his writings, by interlarding them with this favorite belief, and accompanying it with interesting and pious reflections of his own. It is, indeed, surprising, how rapidly the heavenly bodies came to be peopled with intelligent beings, and what curious speculations arose in regard to the destiny and moral status of these celestials.

This happy unanimity of opinion, however, in regard to the main question, was in a somewhat violent style disturbed, a few years ago, by an unknown author, who took up the question anew, with the view of discussing and solving it from a strictly scientific point of view. The conclusions arrived at in his book on the "*Plurality of Worlds*," were of such a startling character, as to produce quite a sensation on both sides of the water. It attempts to show that our old opinions on this point are all a mistake, that none of the heavenly orbs are inhabited, or, at least, that we have no reason to think that they are, and that our own globe is the only body that was thought fit to enjoy this distinction. It was like a bomb-shell thrown into an army resting on its victorious march, not dreaming that it had any longer a single foe to dispute its progress. Old professors became uneasy in their chairs, wiped their spectacles, and proceeded at once to resist this onslaught upon what had come to be considered an established opinion. It is a readable book, full of the latest and most reliable information, written in a clear, calm, persuasive style, pervaded apparently with a pure love of science, and in every respect, we may say, evincing more than ordinary ability in the treatment of scientific subjects. It is regarded by some as inimical to religion, although the writer, who shows no evidence of irreligion in his book, does not think

so; on the contrary, he maintains that his view of the subject harmonizes better with Christianity, than the view which he combats. His arguments, which tend to establish the geocentric view of the universe under a higher form than the old Ptolemaic, are not without force, and certainly worthy of consideration. But they seem to have made no favorable impression on the mind of Sir David Brewster, who, in his old age, felt himself prompted to make a reply, and to show, not only that the heavenly bodies, the sun, moon, and stars, are all inhabited, but that in some way Christianity requires of us to adopt it as a tenet; that it is the creed of the philosopher, and the hope of the Christian.

The usual argument adduced for the plurality of worlds is simple, popular, somewhat utilitarian, and addressed fully as much to the feelings as to the understanding. It alleges that the heavenly bodies are large and magnificent globes, some of them larger, some of them smaller than the earth. As they are composed of matter, possess weight and density, and are subject to the same laws, analogy requires that they, like our earth, should be the abodes of immortal beings like ourselves. Besides, it would seem to be a reflection on the wisdom of the Creator to suppose otherwise, that they are simply huge empty masses of matter floating through space. The nature of God, which is love, would seem to require that He should place intelligent beings in all parts of His works, that they may experience and suitably acknowledge His wisdom and goodness. The argument, as thus stated, applies with the same force to every one of the starry train, and leads to the conclusion that they are all, without exception, inhabited; a conclusion, which its advocates have greeted with full approval, not leaving the objector room to demur, in any single case, to the general assertion. A survey of our own system will probably show, that, presented in this light, it is entirely too wholesale.

From an immoderate desire to people the celestial spaces with rational beings, it has been maintained that the *comets* cannot be denied this honor. Whiston maintained that they were the abodes of lost spirits, whose torments were aggravated by the

extremes of heat and cold to which they were subjected. Another writer thought quite otherwise, and maintained that they were the most delectable abodes in the entire creation. Some of them, at least, describe elliptical orbits, and are known to belong to the solar system. But this is, probably, far from being the case with the large majority of them. They come into our system, then disappear, and never return. They pass off into unknown regions, either in orbits that do not return into themselves, or else, entering into some other solar system, and falling under the attractive influence of some other sun, they are thrown into new orbits, and so pass from system to system spreading consternation wherever they go, as in ages past, or as they do in our days, exciting a deep interest with astronomers, in distant spheres. As messengers, or express trains, passing from one part of the universe to another, at times with immense velocity, it is supposed that they furnish very desirable places of abode; the inhabitants enjoy an admirable opportunity to witness the immensity of creation; among other things, to survey the splendor of Saturn's rings, the belts of Jupiter, and as they come up to the sun, to look into its immense caverns, which appear to us as dark spots on its surface. Such was the romantic dream of a Mr. Lambert, as quoted by Dr. Dick. But comets are better understood in our days, and there is a very slender foundation for such fancies. They are all very rare substances, more so than our atmosphere, sensibly influenced by the planets, but never in the least degree influencing any of them in return.* They have never as yet made the least impression on the solar system, and, though at times so much dreaded, they are most probably very harmless, as much so as our northern lights, which, in some respects, they may resemble. It has been supposed, and it is said, with good reason, that within the present century, our earth passed through a comet's train, and we slept and waked as usual without experiencing any harm. If to their extreme rarity, we add the intense mo-

* Sir Isaac Newton was of the opinion that all the matter in the tail of the largest comet, if condensed to the consistency of our atmosphere, would not occupy more than one cubic inch.

lecular action going on among their particles, as they approach the sun, as was observed in this country at the Cambridge Observatory, when Donati's comet made its appearance in our evening skies some eight or nine years ago, the probability that they carry with them nothing but their own very rarified substance, becomes very strong indeed. So intense must be the action of their particles upon one another as they approach the sun, that, instead of supporting a world of intelligent beings on their surface, it must at times be extremely difficult for them to support themselves. Some years ago Biela's comet was rent into twain by the action of the sun, and it was a long time before the attractive power of its particles brought them together again. Corresponding with these violent changes in one part of their orbits, there are other changes which they undergo as they recede from the sun, when they gather up again as it were their immense trains, and appear to dissolve again into thin vapor as they disappear from view.

Another class of bodies are found within the bounds of our system, which are more dangerous, but less perhaps understood, than the comets. Meteoric stones, or ærolites, have fallen to the earth from the upper regions in different periods of history, and are mentioned in the records of all civilized nations. A large one fell in Thrace in the time of Socrates; another in France, within a more recent period, whose fragments were scattered over an area of thirty acres; and in our own times, many of them have been collected, and may be seen in the museums of this country and Europe. It was at one time supposed that they were projected from volcanoes in the moon; at another, that they were formed somehow in the upper regions of our atmosphere. It is now more generally conceded that they fall to the earth from the planetary spaces; that they revolve in orbits around the sun, perhaps in one continuous current forming a ring, giving rise to the curious phenomenon of the Zodiacal Light seen distinctly in the western sky at this season of the year after evening twilight; that they are essentially minute planets or asteriods, fragments possibly left behind when the planets were first formed; that in a certain part

of their orbit they fall under the influence of the earth's attraction, particularly in the months of August and November, and are consequently drawn towards the earth; and that, as they may at certain periods of the year come between the earth and the sun, they may thus account for several cold days which have been observed to take place regularly about the middle of May, and explain what appeared to be preternatural darkness in the day-time, of which we have well-authenticated accounts in history. Such extremely small planets or satellites, as they may be called, are merely blackened masses of matter, and, of course, they could not have been formed for any economy of their own, but were made, no doubt, for the inhabitants of other spheres, probably only for the study and contemplation of the denizens of our own planet.*

Let us, however, pass from these blackened, burnt ærolites, made up of iron, nickel and other substances, such as we find on the earth's surface, and proceed at once to the sun, the monarch of our system. As he is the centre of the planetary worlds, the source of light and heat to the system, and by his overpowering attraction retains each member in its place; as, moreover, by his august presence, he diffuses life and animation upon planetary worlds, it might be supposed that his mission is purely physical, and subordinate to the other worlds of intelligence. It seems, however that this has not been deemed sufficient, and it has been urged that he is fully as well qualified to be the centre of intellectual as of physical light. As these claims have been made by those distinguished in the annals of science, they are entitled to a passing notice.

The sun, according to Sir W. Herschel, whose views are now

---

* See Humboldt's Cosmos, Art. Ærolites. Chaplain Jones, from careful observations on the Zodiacal Light during Commodore Perry's Expedition to Japan, has come to the conclusion, that the ring is around the *earth*, and not around the sun. The appearance of the Light, both in the east and west, and even spanning the sky at midnight in the tropics, favors such a supposition. Accordingly, the earth has a ring around it, somewhat like that of Saturn, made up of ærolites, or other rare substances, from which fire-balls, shooting-stars, and still heavier bodies, fall to the earth. See Observations on the Zodiacal Light, United States Japan Exhibition, vol. III., 1856.

generally received, consists of a central solid nucleus, of an almost transparent atmosphere of great extent, and then around the whole, of a luminous covering or photosphere, which to us is the visible source of light and heat. This, its physical constitution has been ascertained, by observing numerous and immense caverns on its surface, which to us appear as small dark spots on its disc. In addition, from a singular luminous appearance on the outside of the photosphere, frequently seen during a total eclipse, the corona, it has been with good reason inferred, that there is still another atmosphere, which may have something to do with the formation of the luminous envelop.

On the supposition that the light and heat of the sun are produced immediately in the photosphere, and that it is removed a considerable distance from the central body, say several thousands of miles at least, which is quite probable, and that the heated rays from the outer covering are, in a great measure, absorbed by the atmosphere underneath, it has been maintained, that there is no further difficulty in supposing that the sun is inhabited, nay, that it may afford the most enchanting abode for intelligent beings, if it be not in fact a paradise in itself. It is true, the solar denizens would, at first view, be cut off from all communion with the universe on the outside by the luminosity above, which, if not shaded by a very dense atmosphere, must fall upon their eyes with a brilliancy, of which mundane beings can form no conception, and endanger the visual organs; nevertheless, an active imagination has come to the rescue, and the difficulty, it is thought, may be removed by those immense chasms in its different envelop, the solar spots, extending down to the nucleus, the terra firma of this wonderful and complicated structure. Some of these are from forty to fifty thousands of miles in diameter, and remain open for months, then closing up sometimes as suddenly as they opened. Through these openings, it is thought the inhabitants of the sun may occasionally catch a glimpse of the starry heavens on the outside, and according to Sir David Brewster, "study astronomy in the luminous cupola which encloses them."* But they would

* See More Worlds than One, p. 106.

have an overpowering splendor all around them; and, if we cannot see the stars shine on our distant planet, in the daytime, it is extremely improbable that they, with superior eyesight, could ever get the faintest view of the worlds on the outside.

The important question here, however, is, have we good reason to suppose that the photosphere is the immediate source of the light and heat of the sun? According to some, they are the result of electric or magnetic action proceeding from the interior. A more satisfactory theory, according to others, is the dynamic one, according to which, the solid part of the sun is in a state of intense molecular activity, caused by the pressure of its particles towards the central regions, which, in the case of a body containing so much matter as the sun, must be immense, and call forth an insuperable repulsion from its particles. It becomes a perfectly elastic body, and when once set in motion, it must continue to vibrate for an indefinite period of time; and communicating its vibrations to the etherial fluid, which it is known permeates the universe, produce in our minds, through our senses, the sensation of light and heat. The chemist, also has his theory, which he thinks as satisfactory as any other. He considers the body of the sun metallic, surrounded with an immense atmosphere of oxygen. The central heat either volatilizes the metal, or throws it up continually in fragments, which, coming in contact with the gas, is oxydized, producing combustion, light and heat. The oxide thus formed falls down upon the burning metal, where it is deoxydized, and then sent upwards again, to pass through the same process from age to age. Probably the last two theories combined, would form the true one.

Now, whichever theory is adopted, reason and science both point to the central regions of the sun as the source of its luminous envelop, of its light and heat. It may be granted, that the nucleus is dark and opaque, as the spots seem to show, but so, also, is the wick of a candle, and yet the flame is constantly dependent on it for support. But if this be the case, so intense must be the molecular action of the sun's solid mass,

that very little room is left for the supposition that any kind of organized beings can exist anywhere on its surface.

In the next place, we turn to our nearest neighbor, the moon, and ascertain what science has to say in regard to its inhabitability. Of all the heavenly bodies, it is the best adapted to the test of ocular demonstration. It is comparatively near us, only a little over a quarter of a million of miles from the earth. With a telescope magnifying two hundred times its distance, it is reduced to about twelve hundred miles; and with an instrument of still higher power, the distance is reduced to the same extent. It is said that the telescope has been so much improved, that a portion of the moon's surface, considerably less than the District of Columbia, can be distinctly seen, and that if it contained any such large cities as London or New York, they could be identified. Every portion of the surface turned towards the earth has been examined with untiring assiduity and care, and lunar maps have been constructed, showing its outlines with more accuracy than any which have as yet been made of the earth. Lunar scenery is dreary in the extreme. In every direction it presents the evidences of former volcanic action; innumerable craters are seen in all parts of its surface, though there is evidence for believing that not a single one is now any longer active. They are all extinct, leaving behind them huge gorges or cavities over four miles deep, and from forty to fifty miles in diameter. Sharp precipitous rocks and mountains rise to an immense height, while shapeless crags seem to hang from their sides, apparently on the eve of falling into the chasm below. Mountain ridges traverse a portion of the moon's surface, which challenge the Alps and Andes for wild and sublime scenery. Immense masses of matter lie at the foot of the mountains, or scattered about on the plains, as if the moon had been the veritable battle-ground of the ancient giants. But now these scenes of former strife stand out in sullen grandeur, in the stillness of death itself, without any evidence that a single volcano is any longer active, that vegetation exists in a single place, or that such a progressive being as man has ever had any thing to do in rendering these barren

wastes subject to his wants. There are, we may say, ample facts to show that such a being as man could not exist in those regions. Our satellite is entirely destitute of water, rivers, lakes or seas; it has no atmosphere at all; or if it have any, it must be rarer than that which is called a vacuum in an air-pump. No sounds, therefore, have ever waked up the dread silence of its caverns, its craggy heights or solitary plains. The sky above, in the absence of an atmosphere to reflect its light, is as black as ink, only relieved by the sun, the earth, and the stars, which seem like so many luminous openings through its dark canopy, by which light is admitted from a bright world somewhere beyond. The days are two weeks in length, during which the heat accumulates so as to exceed by far that of our equatorial regions, while during the long nights the cold becomes equally as intense. In view of such facts as these, some of the most ardent friends of a plurality of worlds have, in hopeless despair, given up the moon as a seat of intelligence. Some, however, more sturdy advocates of the favorite theory, have not yielded so gracefully, and have contended that, though the moon is not adapted to such beings as dwell on the earth, it may nevertheless contain a people as intelligent as we are, whose organizations adapt them to their own peculiar places of abode. But this certainly leads us beyond the leading-strings of analogy, and asks of us more than science or our accredited knowledge will allow.

If, then, there are no intelligent beings in the sun, or the moon, or the ærolites, the sweeping assertion that *all* of the heavenly bodies are inhabited, is shorn of its magic power, and we may breathe more freely, if indulging a sober criticism, we are under the necessity of expressing our grave doubts whether some at least of the planets may not be equally void of intelligence. We shall doubtless find, before we get through with our present survey, enough beings in the celestial spaces to satisfy our inward desire to commune and sympathize with distant worlds, without being so exacting as to require every nook and corner, or rude, unorganized mass of matter, to be filled with beings like ourselves, whether they have been supplied

with comfortable and congenial places of abode or not. We now turn to the planets.

They are divided into three groups, which present distinctive family features, and justify such a threefold arrangement; the exterior group, consisting of gigantic masses of matter at an immense distance from the sun, including Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune; the interior, consisting of planets of moderate size, including Mars, Earth, Venus, and Mercury; and perhaps Vulcan, near the sun, which, it is said, was discovered by a French astronomer a few years ago passing over its disc as a dark spot; and an intermediate family of very small bodies, called planetoids, or minor planets, having Jupiter on the one side, and Mars on the other, or inner side.

The planetoids are comparatively very small bodies in our system; one of them (Ceres), is estimated to be only one hundred and sixty-three miles in diameter; others are larger, and some of them still smaller. Four of them were discovered at the beginning of the present century, on the purely theoretical ground, that the order of our system required that there should be another planet between Mars and Jupiter, as the relative distance between these two planets was too great. Discovery then ceased until 1845, when it was resumed, and since then some seventy or eighty of these small bodies have been added to the domain of science. The probability is, that at least several hundred of them will be discovered, or even as many as a thousand, as it would require that many to form a respectable planet. Formerly it was supposed that they were the fragments of a large planet, which had been rent asunder by some tremendous internal convulsion. It is, however, more rational to suppose, that, whilst in the original formation of the planets, the planetary matter was all concentrated around single centres or nuclei, in the case of the planetoids, owing to the scattered and irregular shape of their original mass, numerous centres of attraction were constituted, and as many distinct planets were formed around them. Owing to their diminutive size, little is known about them. They are of different colors—red, blue, yellow, and white; and some of them at least, are surrounded with

hazy envelops, which may be atmospheres. Subject to sudden changes in their illuminating powers, they are supposed to be irregular, sharp and angular in their shapes, and closely allied to the aerolites in their physical constitutions; and as these latter have come down to us without inhabitants, so there is a very strong probability that the former are equally void of life and animation.

On the outside of the planetoids, Jupiter is the next planet that makes his majestic sweep around the sun. He is the largest of the planetary train, and in bulk more than twelve hundred times greater than our earth. His year is nearly twelve of our own; and ponderous as he is, he revolves on his axis and finishes his day in less than ten hours of our time. He has four satellites, that accompany him in his vast orbit around the sun, more than fifteen hundred millions of miles in circumference. He is surrounded by a bright atmospheric envelop, which is generally open in streaks along his equatorial regions, enabling us to look down upon his solid body, and constituting his far-famed belts. The force of winds, combined with his immense diurnal velocity (four thousand six hundred and fifty-eight miles a minute, two thousand greater than a cannon ball), may be the physical cause of these appearances, as they are always parallel to his equator. Here, then, at length we have approached a region in which the necessary conditions for an inhabited world of beings, gifted with intelligence like ourselves, seem to be at hand; nor are we disposed to evade the force of the arguments, that have been adduced to bring that brilliant orb of our nocturnal skies within the sphere of intelligence and reason. In what has already been said, the object has been merely to show that the wholesale assertion that *all* the heavenly bodies are inhabited cannot be sustained by facts, and that the sweeping argument, on which it is based, is to be taken with some grains of allowance. Admitting the force of the claims, which this monarch of the starry train can urge to be the seat of intellectuality, we have nevertheless a few things to say against them, which, if they confine him to a purely physical or material existence, cannot be considered as any fault of ours.

The average density of Jupiter, deduced from accurate calculation, is only a little above that of water (.24, the earth being unity). That of the earth is nearly six times that of water (5.67), which shows that its density towards its centre must be considerably greater than on its surface, and that it must decrease according to some uniform rate from the centre upwards, a result which theory would imperatively require. Applying this law of variable density to the body of Jupiter, and the almost irresistible conclusion is, that bodies on the surface of this planet are considerably less dense than water; for, as the average density of the earth's surface is much less than the average density of the whole globe, so we must suppose it to be with the rest of the heavenly bodies. The supposition, therefore, that Jupiter and his satellites are fluid or watery bodies, carries with it a high degree of probability. Owing to his immense distance from the sun, the amount of light and heat which he receives is only one-twenty-seventh as great as that which reaches our earth, and as a consequence, it might be supposed that he is locked in the embrace of eternal ice. But it must be remembered that the temperature of a planet may be dependent on other conditions besides the heat which is received directly from the sun. Our own temperature may be at least in some degree modified by the heat which reaches us from the interior. So it may be in the case of Jupiter. The cold on the outer surface may be counteracted by the warmth from the central regions. If we suppose this to be the case, we then have, after all, nothing better than a vast world of watery or fluid matter, without shores, and, perhaps, without any solid body; whilst, on the contrary, if the feeble rays of the sun are not strengthened by heat from the centre, then we have its fluid particles congealed into ice, and this vast orb, in all its parts, resembles our polar regions. In either case it presents a forbidding aspect as an abode of happy, enterprising, warm-hearted, intelligent beings like man. If it be said again, in this connection, that they may have organizations, that adapt them to their sphere, we say, let it be so. In the early geological ages of our globe, which presented conditions entirely different from those under which we now live, but

some of them analogous to those which now obtain in the planet Jupiter, different kinds of animated beings for ages existed, precisely adapted to the state of the globe at that time, all of them, however, void of intelligence. Might it not be so now in the Jovian worlds? It may be so, of course. But if animated beings exist there at all, it would seem, that they must be of those orders, which geologists have dug out of our earth, and whose remains, or skeletons, we may now examine in our museums; although they may be supposed by far to exceed in dimensions those ancient monsters, the Iguanadon, the Megalosaurius, or our own American Mammoth.

If, now, Jupiter be divested of the honor of cherishing and raising a vast family of intelligent beings for immortality, then it follows that his neighbors and relatives still farther out in the obscurity of space, Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune, have still less valid claims to this distinguished honor. So it was precisely with that other Jupiter, the Jupiter Olympus of history. No sooner had Christianity shown that his august sway over the gods and men, his high-sounding titles, his once-dreaded thunder-bolts, were nothing more than poetic fancies and dreams, than his whole ideal empire passed away like so much smoke, and with it all the faith in his venerable father Saturn, his grandfather Uranus, and his brother Neptune.

The same arguments that render it improbable that Jupiter is inhabited, we say, apply with still greater force to those bodies that lie beyond him. Saturn receives still less light and heat (.011), only about the $\frac{1}{90}$ ($\frac{1}{91}$) part as much as our earth. This is compensated for, it is true, to some extent, by his eight satellites, and his magnificent rings. These reflectors of light, though not of heat, in the Saturnian sky, have been regarded as a special arrangement for the accommodation of its inhabitants; and the existence of the rings, in particular, has been referred to as manifesting the mark of special design. But whilst they would present a bow, beautiful beyond description, arching the sky every night for fifteen years, to the inhabitants on one side of it, it would exclude the sun from those on the other side night and day for the same length of time. Thus

the disadvantage would be just as great as the benefits during the long Saturnian year, nearly thirty of ours. The average density of Saturn is about that of common cork; and its surface density, for the reason stated in the case of Jupiter, still less. One astronomer considers the ring a train of clouds, and maintains that the mountains of Saturn consist of masses of vapor.* According to the more serious speculations of Bond and Peirce, two of our most distinguished astronomers, based on observation and mathematical reasoning, spoken of with respect by the author of Cosmos, the ring, or rings at least, are decidedly fluid in their character. If this be so, and the density of Saturn be so small, the probability is, that he is not adapted to support even such huge monsters of the deep, as we have found may crawl about and disport in the huge vortices and pools on the surface of Jupiter. Saturn would thus present us with a huge mass of matter, much less perfect, and farther removed from organization, than any of the bodies, which we have thus far been considering. And with regard to the two remaining planets, Uranus and Neptune, that move along the extreme outer circles of our system, like outsiders, the same remark may apply with still more truth in regard to their physical constitution. We shall not speak of these latter, respecting which we know so little, in detail, but shall dismiss them at once, with the single remark, that as they are most probably the oldest among the planets, so are they most probably the least perfect in their organization, and most allied in their physical structure to that original, nebulous chaos, out of which they were formed in the beginning.

We now come down to the group of planets, that includes our earth, all revolving within the planetoids around the sun, and distinguished by marked differences from the other two groups. Here, at least in one case, we find a world of intelligent beings; and it remains for us to inquire, whether there are not others that enjoy the same distinction. With regard to the new planet said to have been discovered during the year 1860, by the French

---

* Cosmos, vol. iv., page 173.

astronomer, Lascarbault, passing across the disc of the sun, and never, perhaps, to be seen, except in its transits, as well as with regard to other small planets, that it is believed, will yet be discovered in the same way,—and with regard to Mercury, which may be the outer orb of a new group, there is reason to doubt whether they have any claims to be admitted into the intellectual society of the universe. The same arguments that were advanced to show that the sun itself was not entitled to this distinction, apply with sufficient force in their cases. Mercury, the most remote of them, receives more than seven times as much light and heat as our earth, which, though perhaps partly absorbed by its atmosphere, must render it, and, of course, whatever other planets there may be still lower down, unfit to be the bearer of intelligence in such close proximity to the burning centre of our physical, planetary system.

There are still two planets that remain to be considered, *Mars* and *Venus*, the one on the outside and the other in the inside of the earth's track around the sun, sometimes in advance of us, sometimes in the rear, sometimes by our side, and always our sentinels in the grand marches through the fields of space. These two planets present so many points of resemblance to the earth, and, moreover, afford so many conditions of life and animality, that we now feel that we are at length approaching the abodes of beings like ourselves, of beings luminous with the light of intelligence, and warming in the sunshine of affection and love. Here as philosophers, as well as Christians, we must separate from the unknown author of "Plurality of Worlds," who may be regarded as a faithful companion, in his judgments at least, if not always in his reasonings, with whom to travel in the dark, cold regions beyond the star of Jove, or on the burning plains of ether, forever dazzling in the neighborhood of the sun. Extremes usually beget each other, and so it is probably in this case. Our author, in his zeal to sweep away from the science of astronomy speculations that have no scientific basis, has no doubt done violence also to those which have more than a mere fanciful foundation.

Both Mars and Venus bear a striking resemblance to the earth, which we look for in vain in the case of the other planets. They occupy with us an intermediate region in our system, removed far enough, on the one hand, from the cold, vapory worlds beyond the planetoids, and far enough also from the torrid zone around the sun on the other. They revolve together in the more temperate regions of our system. Both smaller than our earth, they do not differ much from it in size; they revolve upon their axis in nearly the same time; they differ from each other slightly, only so much as their different positions in the system require, in density, in light, heat, and the force of gravity at their surface. Like our earth, they are solid bodies, have atmospheres, and present the appearance of being diversified with continents, oceans, mountains, and valleys. The natural divisions on the planet Mars are particularly observable through the telescope. A large portion of his surface presents a ruddy, ochry tinge, which, with good reason, is supposed to be land, while another adjoining it has a greenish hue, which, for an equally good reason, is believed to point out its seas and oceans. These fixed divisions are often effaced for short periods of time, which is no doubt caused by clouds and mists floating in its atmosphere. Around its poles sometimes brilliant white zones make their appearance, as they turn toward the sun, and emerge from their polar winter. These, appearing and disappearing, can be nothing else but snow and ice, pushing themselves towards the temperate regions. Its seasons, though longer, are the same as those of the earth.

Venus differs from Mars, in having an atmosphere of such a character, either of density, or brilliancy, as to prevent us from seeing the natural configuration of its surface. Spots, however, and indications of mountains and a general inequality of surface, have been observed. Its seasons are peculiar, and different from those of the other planets. Owing to the great inclination of its axis to the plane of its orbit (75°), its tropics are elevated to within 15° of its poles, and its polar circles lie within 15° of its equator. The sun, therefore, in its

annual course, approaches within so many degrees of either pole. It has, in consequence, eight seasons, two of each kind enjoyed on the earth. They follow each other in quick succession, are about two weeks long, and when properly tempered by a dense atmosphere, they may produce the most agreeable climate. Here, then, science and observation favor the supposition that we have found inhabited worlds like our own. That brightest of all the starry strain, the morning star, the harbinger of our day, and also the evening star, which has been observed in the early dawn and the dewy eve, with so much interest in all ages and by all people, so famed for its pure and mellow light, and seeming to look benignantly down upon the earth and man; this star, appropriately called the star of love, together with Mars, who sometimes shines with almost equal brilliancy, are, as we have good reason to believe, bound to us not only by the ties of physical gravitation, but by the higher bonds of an intellectual and spiritual existence. Here, then, we might pause in our long journey through celestial space, and indulge ourselves for a few moments in questions, which o course cannot be satisfactorily answered. What kind of beings inhabit these planets? Doubtless they are moral and intellectual, such as we are, with an immortal destiny before them. What grade of beings are they, as compared with man? Either higher or lower than man, quite likely; for nature abhors a dull, monotonous sameness or uniformity, as much as she does a vacuum. Everywhere she presents herself in a progressive state from the lower to the higher forms of existence. Minerals progress one above the other, from foul earth up to the diamond, that glitters on the coronal of beauty; the fungi are succeeded by orders of plants each one excelling the other in perfection of organization up to the fairy flower, that seems to whisper to the breezes, and to the majestic oak and the towering cedar of Lebanon, that seem to demand the homage of men; the eagle is the king of birds; lions and elephants are monarchs among animals; and man himself rises from the filthy tribes that eat dirt and grass, to the highest order of civilization and refinement. Evidence has been adduced to show that there is

such a progress in the solar system, from those cold, vapory bodies far off in space to those planets, which present an organization of the most perfect kind. It now remains only to be said, that this progress must culminate somewhere, and this culmination, as we have seen, must be in one of the three planets which we have been just considering. If size, and centrality of position with reference to the other two, as well as other considerations, which might be adduced, have any weight, then the preponderance is in favor of our planet; the earth, inferior as it may be in certain physical aspects to other planets, is the real culminating point in our solar system; physically, the heliocentric theory of our system must be conceded to be the true one, while intellectually, the geocentric must be conceded; and *man* stands, or was intended to stand, not only at the head of the different orders of beings on the earth, but also to occupy the highest position in the solar system. It is, however, not material, how this question is decided, whether for or against us. Both Venus and Mars may be inhabited by intelligent beings, that exceeded man in original endowments, and never having fallen, as man has, have gone far beyond their original state in the way of progress and improvement.* Or,

* Dr. Brewster thinks that the inhabitants of all the heavenly bodies have sinned, because the existence of moral evil, as he believes, is a *necessary* part of the scheme of the universe. There was, however, only one Atonement necessary for all. The sacrifice of Christ on the cross here on earth is, in some way which he does not explain, made available to all the sinners throughout the universe. Such a theory as this rests upon a purely mechanical view of the Incarnation and the Atonement. If the vivific power of Christ's person could reach man only as he entered the life of humanity and became its head, then the inhabitants of other worlds could never come in contact with this life; and if they have sinned, they can be saved only as Christ becomes incarnate also in their specific natures; and the incarnation of the Son of God must be multiplied to an almost indefinite extent, which is difficult to believe. But happily there is no necessity for such a supposition. It is much easier to believe that sin is something *incidental* in the Cosmos, and not a *necessity* to man's highest elevation. It may have been permitted in one case here on earth, in order that God might have an opportunity to display the magnitude of His mercy and grace to myriads upon myriads of worlds that have never fallen. See More Worlds than One, chap. VII., *Religious Difficulties*. The same theological difficulties, arising from the relation of the Incarnation to the Atonement, press with equal force against the modern French theory, according to which there must have been different origins of the human race in order to account for the great variety which it presents.

if their original endowments were inferior to ours, they may now, at least for the time being, stand far above us in cultivation and purity. Whichever view is adopted, man, in any case, must be conceded to occupy a towering position in the grand system to which he belongs; the apex of many worlds beneath him, all of which were constructed for him, and with reference to his sovereignty.

We now turn to the *fixed stars*. Here we may expect to be more successful in finding beings allied to man, than we have been in our excursions through the planetary realms. Here the region is so vast, and the inhabited worlds, if there be such at all, must be so numerous, that, if we have any feelings of regret, that such bodies as Jupiter, Saturn, and Uranus are uninhabited, they will, we think, all vanish. We will also, no doubt, soon be reconciled to this idea, when we reflect that vast as these bodies are, they have been made for man, and for *students* in particular; that they might study them, plod their way through a course of mathematics, so as at length to comprehend the laws which govern them. This, certainly, is a high and noble destiny, if man is what the Bible says he is.

We are now, let us remember, in the region of the fixed stars; we have passed beyond the solar system into the real immensity of creation; we have been successful in getting our little bark out of what, after all, is only one of those little eddies, that are so numerous on the shores of the universe, and we are safely floating in the vast ocean of being. But as we leave our home near the sun, not only do the planets, which we have been considering, grow small, very small indeed comparatively, less than a drop in the ocean, but our entire solar system, at least five thousand millions of miles in extent, dwindles down into an insignificant point as viewed from the ethereal heights which we have reached. The distance of the nearest fixed star from our earth, according to reliable trigonometrical calculations, is nearly twenty millions of millions of miles.* Take this distance as

* The first star in the constellation Centaurus, whose parallex is less than one second, Sirius, the Dog Star, is four times further from the earth.

your standard of measure, and conceive, if you can, of the distance of those stars that are twice, a hundred, or a thousand times as far from us. We need not fear we have grasped after an exaggeration, but may be assured that we have fallen far short of the truth. Then, too, we must think of the number of stars that lie scattered about on the fields of space. Sir W. Herschel estimates that fifty thousand of them passed before his telescope in an hour's time, in a section of the milky way not more than a foot square. The milky way, however, with the stars that are visible to us, form only one firmament among many others, only one cluster of stars, whilst beyond it, other clusters of the same kind rise up to view in the distant nebulæ, which, on account of their extreme distances, dwindle into small nebulous patches of light or mist, increasing in number as the space-penetrating power of the telescope is increased.

All of the fixed stars are bodies of immense magnitude, many of them larger than our sun (which is 888,000 miles in diameter). Sirius alone, in its system, shines with a splendor sixty-three times greater than that of the sun. They, in fact, are suns, centres of light, heat, and attraction to immense spheres of space; and arranged, as we have said, in starry clusters, they form firmaments upon firmaments, whose bright stars look down, no doubt, as ours do, from their azure heights upon innumerable seats of intelligence and joy.

It is not likely that the fixed stars themselves are inhabited; they are suns, physical centres, like our own orb of day, which we have seen contains nothing but matter in an intense state of ignition. But the probability that they all sustain planetary trains, like our own, is very great, indeed; we may say, almost irresistible. Here in this higher department of creation, the argument from analogy, and the *a priori* one, drawn from the character of the Creator, which we have seen is defective when applied with rigor to our solar system, is entitled to our highest regard, and cannot be resisted, unless, like Hume, we make up our minds to believe nothing except that which comes under our own sensuous experience. Observation, of course, leaves the question of planetary worlds revolving around the fixed stars

undecided. They are so remote, so far beyond the power of the telescope, that it is not at all likely that they will ever be seen from the earth; but just because they are so far beyond the reach of the human eye, the argument drawn from observation to prove their non-existence, is shorn of all force whatever, and, properly speaking, has no weight one way or the other. The case is one, in which Science, strictly so called, based on observation, finds a limit, which it cannot transcend; and here, where its power fails, it becomes us to inquire what may be learned from a higher sphere of thought.

Analogy does not leave the question so undecided, so entirely destitute of a reply. It requires that, if one sun in a grand system of bodies like itself, be attended with planets, then the rest should be similarly attended, that these blazing orbs of light and heat should not be permitted to waste themselves on emptiness and vacuity; that these bodies, which form the main part of our Cosmos should not be allowed to contribute nothing, or next to nothing in the realization of the grand design of creation; that is, in a word, they should not be centres with their circumferences nowhere. There is no absurdity in supposing that the planets, which, after all, are relatively small bodies, were made for man; but it would be manifestly absurd in the highest degree, to suppose that all the suns in the universe were made for the earth, when the greater part of them will never be seen by man, and when plainly one sun is sufficient to meet all the wants of our own planet. The fixed stars are scarcely allowed a place in astronomy, strictly so called, so little we know of them; but no doubt each one has an astronomy of its own, understood and studied by our fellow-astronomers in distant spheres.

We are, however, not left to analogy, in surmising that there are worlds like our own in attendance upon the fixed stars. Modern science has supplied us with the outlines, at least, of an argument, which may yet bring this question within the range of mathematical certainty. Every advance in astronomy has rendered it more and more probable, that all our own planets were formed one after another out of the sun; that there was

an actual progress, a gradual genesis from chaotic matter up to the present beauty and symmetry of our system. Either, according to the nebular theory, the sun was originally a vast nebula, or chaos, extending beyond the planet Neptune, whose particles, acted upon by the force of gravity, would produce, in the first place, a rotatory motion of the entire mass,—and, in the next place, successive condensations, easily explained by the laws of dynamics.

In the course of time, the centrifugal force preponderating over the centripetal, rings like those which surround the planet Saturn, would be thrown from their equators, which, losing their equilibrium, with one exception, the case of Saturn, broke up into masses, and according to laws, which may be easily understood, formed themselves into planets. Or, possibly, they may have been formed out of the substance of the sun by some other process, which has not as yet been explained. The particular theory of creation that is here adopted, is of no material account. The *main truth*, that the planets are the immediate offspring of the sun, by a genetic process, is forcing itself more and more every year upon the minds of scientific men, and it can no longer be resisted. It is, indeed, the great problem of Astronomy in our day, to explain *how* the Cosmos arose out of chaos, just as in Geology it is the object to point out the different stages through which our globe has passed in arriving at its present perfect condition. Now in proportion as this truth is established, in the same proportion is the existence of planetary worlds around other suns besides our own, brought within the sphere of mathematical certainty. Admit that our own planets were evolved by necessary dynamical laws out of the sun, as astronomers will all soon have to admit, and planetary worlds without number, never seen and never to be seen by mortal eye, at once spring into existence along the heights and depths of space. For the forces that in the beginning were active in forming our planets out of rude, chaotic matter, must be supposed to have been equally as active, when the fixed stars passed from their nebulous to their present finished state; that is, as their own nebulæ condensed, they threw off rings by a

dynamical necessity, and these rings, by the same necessity, in the great majority of cases, formed themselves into planets. But why were these planets formed more numerous, of course, than the fixed stars, unless that they might become systems like our own, to find their culmination in rational and intelligent beings? Indeed, if, as we have endeavored to show, there is such a progress in our own system from the rudest matter up to intelligent man, there was doubtless a *law* underlying the whole process, and that same law must have been just as active in other systems as in our own. There is here, again, no necessity that we, in our zeal and philanthropy, should make it a point of orthodoxy to believe that every planet in the universe is necessarily inhabited. Some, many of them, may never have arrived at such a perfect state. The law of progress, which we have regarded as highly probable here, as we know it to be everywhere else in nature, would, indeed, at once preclude any such a supposition. There is, in fact, no necessity for it, either in the character of God or in the social wants of man or angels. We may suppose that myriads upon myriads are uninhabited, and yet there will be enough left to be the seats of intelligence. Inhabited worlds loom up to our view out of the obscurity of space in such overpowering array, that we are already staggered in our attempts to grasp their number, not to speak of the multitudes of beings like ourselves that dwell upon them, more numerous than the leaves in thousands of forests. Indeed, should there be only one inhabited planet in each solar system, the "sympathy of those feeling hearts that would find sympathy in the moon," as Bessel expresses himself, would find ample space for its largest exercise, in other though more distant spheres. Nor should we for a moment entertain the idea, that the numerous uninhabited planets, possibly the greater part of them, were made for nought. It ought to be sufficient for us to know that they were made for man, or beings like him; that as they minister to his spiritual or intellectual wants, they subserve a truly noble object, whilst they display the extent of the Creator's goodness to His creatures in a manner, inferior only to that in which it is revealed in Revelation, and afford us an impres-

sive illustration of the light in which He regards intellectual beings like man in the immensity of His works.

Here, again, we may pause, and inquire what position man occupies among the innumerable orders of related beings, that inhabit the celestial spaces. Of course, there is no room here to suppose that there is any thing like an equality among those numerous races. That were a dull monotony, which nature itself would reject; it would be, we might almost say, a monstrous anomaly, that would wrest from the Cosmos half of its order and beauty. Progress from the lower to the higher, is the law in the intellectual, as well as in the non-intellectual world. Analogy imperiously demands that there should be a progress among the celestial races, a gradation rising higher and higher, and a termination of the process somewhere. Where, we might ask, is that termination? It must be somewhere; and a race of beings inhabiting some one of the heavenly bodies must have been formed by the Creator to stand at the head of the rest, to serve as the last and the nearest approach to Himself. For what we know, the earth may have been intended as the favored spot, and man may have been the honored race.

But *man* probably is not the culminating point of these innumerable orders of intelligent beings. We read of angels that are higher than man; and whether we regard them as having once lived on planets like ourselves, but now translated from the sphere of nature to the sphere of spirit, which we may safely do, or as pure spirits, which never had any thing to do with matter, their present exaltation seems to prove that there are races of beings superior to man. This, however, would not detract from his native dignity, nor the high position that he occupies in the Cosmos. Associated with innumerable orders of beings, differing from himself only in some slight degree, with some above and some below him, he is great, great indeed. Else why was the sun, and at least some of its attendant planets formed for him, that they might cherish in him the germ of his physical existence, and contribute their part in educating him for his immortal destiny? Consider him, if you choose, the lowest in the grade of intelligence, and still he is worth more

than the whole material universe; for *this*, in its appointed time, must pass away, while man has an immortal destiny before him. Planets, suns and systems are simply matter in a more or less rude state, while man, endowed with an intellectual, moral and religious nature, rises infinitely higher than matter, under its grandest and most imposing forms. His body indeed is the most perfect and the most beautiful organization of which matter is susceptible, and yet, fearfully and wonderfully as it has been made, it is nothing more than the servant of the soul.

Let us now recapitulate. We have seen that man probably stands at the head of the solar system, its apex and crown, with different grades of material bodies below him descending to the lowest forms of matter. We have also seen, that there are other systems like his own, which, though probably desert in some parts, doubtless have also fertile, temperate regions, like his own, in which innumerable orders of intelligent beings like himself rise one above the other, and that he occupies a link high in the series, which ascends in perfection to the very foot of the Creator's throne.

This is the position which, we think, an unbiased astronomy gives to man. It differs, we are aware, from that which is often assigned to him by those who are thoroughly acquainted with all the facts in the case. The common, popular rationalistic inference is, that, if the universe be so vast, so sublime, as astronomers tell us it is, then man is very insignificant indeed, so insignificant, that it is hard to conceive how it is possible for the Great Creator to notice him at all; and it is thought all the while, that this depreciation of man is in full harmony with the Bible. But some more logical than others, have not hesitated to conclude that it is altogether impossible, that it is all a myth, a fable, the product of human pride, to suppose that God ever troubles himself at all about man. This view, of course, we hold to be not only unchristian, inhuman and infidel, but at the same time unscientific in the extreme.

The Word of God, it is true, speaks of man as a worm of the dust, as of yesterday, as insignificant; but it does so only in

contrast with his Maker and not in contrast with his works. Thus, in the 8th Psalm, where it is said, "When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which Thou has ordained, what is man, that Thou art mindful of him; and the son of man, that Thou visitest him," the contrast is not between man and the heavenly bodies, as is often supposed, but between him and the Creator of these things; for it is immediately added, for "Thou hast made him little lower than the angels, and *hast crowned him with glory and honor.*" The exaltation of man above the works of creation, so far from being opposed to the tenor of the Scripture, goes hand in hand with it from the beginning to the end. For, once put him in his proper place on the heights of Creation, its lord and ruler, and then we understand at once the significance of the fall. How great must it have been! It is no mere fancy to suppose that it sent a thrill of horror throughout the universe, when he fell from his high estate. It was a snapping asunder of the strings that produced the grand anthem of praise that was continually to ascend to the great Maker and Father of alg From this point of view, we may also see that there is nothinl. absurd in the supposition, that God became man, as infidel astronomers are so free in asserting. On the contrary, the Incarnation is in perfect harmony with the order and design of nature; and eternal life beyond the grave, so far from being a poetic dream, is the necessary complement of man's existence here in the midst of these material worlds. All the errors into which unbelieving astronomers and scientific men fall, in regard to the subject of religion, result from the wrong point of view which they have selected. They are all more or less guilty of a refined worship of the system of nature, whether they are aware of it or not. Its grandeur and immensity are so overpowering to their view, that like the fire-worshippers of the orient, they fall down and worship it, not imagining, as it would seem, that nature after all is nothing more than the grand palace furnished by the goodness and wisdom of the Almighty for His rational creatures. What is required of us is to get a correct view of man's true position, or, rather, what was in-

tended originally to be his true destiny, and then we shall not only gain a more elevated view of the universe itself, but of that spiritual and invisible world with which we also stand connected. Man is the centre of nature, and to himself is the homage of creatures beneath him due. Making *quality*, and not *quantity*, the basis of comparison, every individual must feel that he is of more account in the sight of God and intelligent beings, than the whole solar system, as such; that even an infant on its mother's breast, is something greater, more important, and more valuable than the planet Jupiter or Saturn, or the Sun itself.

Both the Cosmos and Man, however, are only creatures, and have their value no less than their existence only in their relation to the great Creator, whose servants they are, and whose glory they are intended to proclaim. Both spheres show forth His praise, and are intended to be revelations of His glory. Nature, mute and unconscious, could do this only through man, who was to be its priest and spokesman. In the nature of the case, therefore, the service which it renders to its Maker, must be inferior to that which man is expected to perform. St. Paul speaks of the two kinds of revelation, and presents them to us in their proper character. In regard to the light of nature, he speaks thus, Romans i. 20: "For the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and *Godhead;* so that they that is, the heathen, are without excuse." Here a revelation of God in nature is asserted; It is one that may be seen and felt by all alike, and is of such an important character, that the heathen are said to be without excuse, when they forsake God and worship idols. In another place, he speaks of the other revelation, made in Christ, the representative of humanity, which, in consequence of the fall, was not capable of being the medium of such a revelation, and must, therefore, have a representative head, the Word made flesh. Speaking of Christ, he says, "For in Him dwelleth the fulness of the *Godhead* bodily." Coloss. ii. 9. To the English reader, the word, Godhead, in both passages, means

the same thing; but it is remarkable that the apostle uses different, though similar words in the original. In the former case, he employs *θειότης* from *θεῖος* divine; in the latter, *θεότης* from *θεός* God, words of the same origen, but evidently differing in their import. The latter has a much more intensive meaning than the former. The one, which is used to express the Godhead, as revealed in nature, refers not so much to God Himself, as to His external *attributes*, His greatness, His power, that which is divine in Him; while the other has a much deeper and comprehensive meaning, and refers to God himself, to His personality, as the God and Father of all, the Deity, not simply the Divinity. *

Thus nature looks up to man, and man to God, through Christ his head; and in God, the author and source of both, the meaning of the whole movement is unfolded.

ART. VI.—THE TWO SYSTEMS.

This little work,† of one page, was published, it appears, in 1866, though distributed in 1867. It has been sent to us, and as it is our duty to notice new publications, we, of course, take suitable notice of this little work. The work being short, consisting only of a single page, it is in our power to confer upon it an honor which we cannot always bestow upon the works we notice—that is, *quote the whole work*. We ask for it a careful perusal. Here it is, title and all. The *italics* are in the original, as here given.

THE TWO SYSTEMS.

READER, there are two distinct and separate systems of Christianity at the present day. It is useless to deny it. Their existence is a great fact, and one that cannot be too clearly known.

According to one system, religion is a mere *corporate business*. You are to belong to a certain body of people. By virtue of your membership of this body, vast privileges, both for time and eternity, are conferred upon you. It matters little what you are, and what you *feel*. You are not to try yourself by your *feelings*. You are a member of a great ecclesiastical corporation. Then all its privileges and immunities are your own. Do you belong to the one true visible ecclesiastical corporation? That is the grand question.

According to the other system, religion is eminently *a personal business* between

---

* See Robinson's Lexicon of the Greek Testament; also, Olshausen & Trench.

† The City Monthly Visitor, July, 1866, p. 1.

yourself and Christ. It will not save your soul to be an outward member of any ecclesiastical body whatever, however sound that body may be. Such membership will not wash away one sin, or give you confidence in the day of judgment. There must be personal faith in Christ, personal dealings between yourself and God, personal felt communion between your own heart and the Holy Ghost. Have you this personal faith? Have you this felt work of the Spirit in your soul? This is the grand question. If not, you will be lost.

Reader, this last system is the system which those who are called *evangelical ministers* cleave to and teach. They do so because they are satisfied that it is the system of holy Scripture. They do so because they are convinced that any other system is productive of most dangerous consequences, and calculated to delude men fatally as to their actual state. They do so because they believe it to be the only system of teaching which God will bless, and that no church will flourish so much as that in which *repentance, faith in Christ, conversion, and the work of the Spirit,* are the grand subjects of the minister's sermons.

DISTRIBUTED BY THE
PHILADELPHIA TRACT AND MISSION SOCIETY,
No. 115 South Seventh Street.
PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY,
150 Nassau Street, New York: 1210 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

Such is this little work, which was distributed in the pews of churches in Philadelphia, in March, 1857. That such matter should be published with the imprimatur of American Tract Society, has been wondered at by many. That institution has always professed to respect the views of the Churches represented in it, and from which it receives its support. But here is an attack, not only upon the views of all denominations (congregationalists perhaps alone excepted), but upon the very conception of the Church of Jesus Christ, and an outright Seperatism boldly advocated. "The two systems" here contrasted, are the system in which the Church is *acknowledged*, and that in which the Church is *rejected;* and the rejection of the Church from the faith of Christians, is demanded, under pain of damnation, with a stronger anathema than that of the Athenasian Creed. It asks, Do you receive this conception of religion, which not only sets aside, but caricatures and attempts to make ridiculous the Church—"If not, you will be lost!"

Have not the churches, into which such Gnostic and Montanistic stuff is thrust, symbols of faith, catechisms, forms of doctrine, pastors, and synodical watchfulness over their faith? Is there need that the members of the Church should be insulted by the imprecations and anathemas of irresponsible, self-constituted orthodoxy peddlers, and have their very sanctuaries profaned by their infidel expectorations? No wonder that, among many others, a Presbyterian elder, on leaving the church, in which these feathers of a foul bird had been dropped, writhed in holy indignation under the keenness of the insult offered to his faith.

With the first paragraph of this Tract we agree. "There are two distinct and separate systems of Christianity at the present day. It

is useless to deny it. Their existence is a great fact, and one that cannot be too clearly known." The only criticism we make on this statement is, that one of these two cannot properly be called a *system*—much less a system of Christianity. It has, as we shall show, nothing of the organic coherence of a system; and, though based on some features of Christianity, it is fundamentally at war with the Christian system.

Let us examine what are here called "the two systems."

First, the Church System, or the System which acknowledges the divine institution of the Church as a means of salvation. The reader will notice that, in setting forth this system, the Tract uses language calculated, if not designed, to misrepresent and caricature the Church, and the true system of Christianity based upon a confession of it. Of this character are the phrases, "religion is a mere *corporate business*"—"it matters little what you are, and what you *feel*"—"visible ecclesiastical corporation." These expressions are clearly designed to ridicule the very idea of the Church of Jesus Christ! But let that pass; it is plain enough, that the paragraph is designed to portray the system of Christianity which acknowledges the Church.

The Church system is set forth thus:

"According to one system, religion is a mere *corporate business*. This means, when stripped of its underlying ridicule, that, according to the Church system, religion comes in and through the Church, and an interest in it is to be secured and maintained in union with the Church. Is not this exactly the Gospel? Is not the Church the "body of Christ" and what is that but a "corporate" body. Where is Christ present but in the Church, which is *His body*, "the fulness of Him that filleth all in all?" (Eph. i. 22, 23.)

"You are to belong to a certain body of people." Does not the Gospel directly enjoin this? This Gnostic would teach, that you are *not* to belong to a certain body of people! Does not the very idea of the Church involve and constitute a body of people? Must not the *body of Christ* have members, and do not these members stand in living union with the body? Yea, do not the members proceed from the body, and is not the body, in the order of life, before the members? Can any one be a member of Christ without being a member of His body? Moreover, did not Christ institute holy Baptism for the very purpose of initiating or incorporating persons with the body of Christ? Does not the Apostle teach, that by one Spirit all are baptized into one body? Were not three thousand, on the day of Pentecost, by baptism, "added" to "a certain body of people?" Does not St. Paul say to the Christians at Ephesus, that they are "fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets; Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom *all the building*, fitly framed together, *groweth* unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom *ye also are builded together*, for an habitation of God through the Spirit?" (Eph. ii. 19—22). Is not this "a certain body of people," to whom it is our duty and privilege to belong?

"By virtue of your membership of this body, vast privileges, both for time and eternity, are conferred upon you." This, again, is of the very essence of the Gospel system of salvation. Who denies that the member has vast privileges conferred on it by virtue of its being in the body? What is the promise to those who, by baptism, are incorporated into the Christian Church? Nothing less than the promise of "the remission of sin, and gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts ii. 38.) Has this Gnostic never read, that, "as many as are baptized in Jesus Christ, have *put on Christ?*" Has he never read what St. Peter says of those who were saved by Noah's ark, "the like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us?" Has he never read the glorious words of St. Paul: "Buried with Him in baptism, *wherein* also ye *are risen* with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead." (Col. ii. 12.) Yea, if we could make our voice thunder, we would endeavor to make the true, everlasting Gospel known to even such stupid ears, and say in flat contradiction of this miserable Tract, that in no other way than "by virtue of your membership of this body, are vast privileges, both for time and eternity, conferred upon you."

"It matters little what you are, and what you *feel.*" A base slander on the Church system, to which we reply in Dr. Nevin's classical and merciful Latin: "*Mentiris impudentissime!*" The Church system teaches that it *does* matter what a member of the Church is and feels. Yea, it is this Church system alone, which furnishes the true, and the most powerful motives to a holy life. How can those, who believe and realize that they are incorporated in the body of Christ, consistently remain dead members! How can they, who are temples of the Holy Ghost, defile that temple! How can he, who feels himself to be in the midst of a cloud of witnesses, fail to feel that he must lay aside every weight, and every sin that besets him, that he may strive for the prize. Let any one read the sixth chapter of Romans, where St. Paul first sets forth the high prerogatives of those, who are in the body of Christ by baptism, and then follows with soul-stirring exhortations based on just that fact, and he will see whether the Church system teaches that it makes little difference what one who is in the Church is and feels! All of the Epistles are full of the same thing. The saints are to depart from all sin, and live in all holiness, just *because* they stand in a bosom of vital powers by which they are perpetually stimulated so to do. "Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace. God forbid."

In the same style of misrepresentation, the remainder of the paragraph goes on to say, in effect, that, according to the Church system, to belong to the Church is all that is necessary—that this is itself sure salvation. The same merciful Latin, above quoted, will answer this foul slander. The Church system teaches, with St. Paul, that great as are the privileges, prerogatives, and advantages conferred by virtue of our union with the Church, all this "grace may be received in vain." Yea, it teaches that it is possible for any one, just

because he stands on this high vantage ground, to make the more fearful plunge into perdition. To a young man, who stands in a Christian family, where he inherits a good name, a pure faith, and all the advantages afforded by his position, we say: "By virtue of your membership of this family, vast privileges, both for time and eternity, are conferred upon you;" but it matters, not little, but much, what use you make of them. They are yours to use for high ends, and they are yours to abuse for deeper degradation; but in either case they are vast privileges, and in either case they are yours. In the same language the Church system addresses its members: "It is a great grace which is yours in the Church—a grace which you can only have in its bosom; we therefore beseech you, 'receive not this grace of God in vain.'"

"You are not to try yourself by your *feelings.*" Another false issue. This is to make the impression that, according to the Church system, feeling is not included in religion. This is again false. Religion affects the whole being of man. But, now, this sentence is to teach that we are to *try* ourselves by our feelings; in other words, feeling is the true, and only true test of religion. Are we to understand, that as a man feels, so he is? The Pharisees felt that they were more holy than all others. The Scriptures speak of those, who shall think that they are doing God's service, by putting to death Christ's servants. Paul, while he was still Saul, felt that he ought verily to persecute the saints at Damascus. The old man, who, in such mild serenity brought his bundle of faggots for the burning of Polycarp, that the martyr himself was induced to exclaim, "*O sancta simplicitas,*" felt supremely pious in the act. Where do you find such assurance of feeling as that enjoyed by the dancing Dervishes, who, having wrought themselves up into an ecstacy by the rythmic cry, "Alla hoo—Alla hoo—Alla hoo," are laid like stiffened corpses around the worshipping circle! Or, if you want a similar assurance of feeling in the professedly Christian sphere, take that miserable cluster of fanatics in the time of the Reformation, who assembled in a hot room, stripped themselves to nudity, greased themselves with lard, rubbed themselves in the heated room, then sat bent in silence looking at their own navels, till the Spirit came and effected a circulation, the result of which was the most enrapturing assurance of feeling! Or, is it the inward light of George Fox, which is meant? What dream, of what grade of fanaticism is meant to be the test to try ourselves by? We know full well that all this is discarded, but we know just as well that it is all involved in the test of feeling. Who shall try the spirits whether they be of God? Shall feeling try itself by itself? Shall a man lift himself by his own boot-straps? Does not St. Paul say, that those who "measure themselves by themselves, are not wise?" Those who adopt this test are on the ground of the wildest fanaticism, and have no defence against it.

When we deny the validity of the rule and test of true piety thus set up, we speak the language of even the oldest English and American Divines, whose practical works are published by the American

Tract Society—such as Owen, Baxter, Doddridge, and especially Edwards on the Affections. While they very properly teach that feeling is included in religion, yea, that it is necessarily included in it, they just as decidedly deprecate the idea, that a Christian is to make feeling a sure test. This is condemned as the source of the subtlest and most dangerous self-deception.

Where, we earnestly ask, does holy Scripture teach that we are to try ourselves by our feelings? It gives us a far more certain and safer test of piety. It teaches men, that would be sure of salvation, to repent, and turn away from sin, to submit to holy baptism, and thus to enter the ark of Christ's Church, to be renewed in the inward man, to continue steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, in breaking of bread, and in prayers. It teaches them to live lives of faith, and good works, to cultivate heavenly-mindedness, to walk in the Spirit, and not fulfil the lusts of the flesh. Such lives carry the evidence of regeneration and growing sanctification in themselves. They are known by their fruits; these being unto holiness, the end will be everlasting life. The Holy Spirit, who does not speak of Himself, in the Church, and by the means of grace, takes of the things of Christ, and shows them to His obedient and believing children. *With* such a spirit of piety and fruitfulness goes the witness of the Holy Spirit, and assures us that we are the children of God, and heirs of everlasting life.

Having thus shown that the system caricatured and condemned by the Tract is in reality the divinely-instituted system of the Gospel, we have, at the same time, indirectly exhibited the other system as fundamentally false. But let us review it briefly.

"According to the other system, religion is eminently *a personal business* between yourself and Christ." We say yes, if you mean, that it is a personal business between us and Christ, *through the Church, by the use of the Holy Sacraments;* but, if you mean that it is a business separate from these, and that it is to be accomplished without these, then we say unequivocally that it is fundamentally false—a flat denial and contradiction of the Gospel. Can you make Christ set aside His own institutions, and get the Holy Spirit to sanction, and by His favor, endorse your amended gospel? This is what your scheme involves.

"It will not save your soul to be an outward member of any ecclesiastical body whatever, however sound that body may be." No, it will not save you to be an *outward* member; but it will save you to be an outward *and inward* member. Is being an *outward* member, and *no* member at all, the only alternative? *Rotten* apples are found on apple trees. Good, *sound* apples, are also found on apple trees. But are apples found that have not grown on apple trees? Perhaps you will understand the parable better in this form: The Church is a mother. The mother's family has some bad children. The mother's family has some good children. Has she any good children that were not born of her, and that do not belong to her family?

"Such membership will not wash away one sin, or give you confidence in the day of judgment." Mere outward membership certainly will not. But where has Christ made provision for outward membership? Has He instituted empty forms for sacraments? If He did, would not He be a formalist? God forbid. Peter tells those who, on the day of Pentecost repented, to be baptized "for the remission of sins." The Nicene Creed, which no age, Protestant or Roman, has questioned, and which the "Church Union" organ of Brooklyn and New York adopts, with the Apostles', as its Creed, teaches us to say: "We confess one Baptism for the Remission of Sins." Baptism, which alone admits into the Church, may, after all, have something to do with the remission of sins; or has it been instituted *for* a purpose, with which it has nothing whatever to do? If it will give us "no confidence in the day of judgment" that we were baptized, and thus members of the Church, will it give us confidence in that day that we were not?

"There must be personal faith in Christ, personal dealings between yourself and God, personal felt communion between your own heart and the Holy Ghost." Yes, surely. What other "faith," what other "dealings," what other "felt communion" than *personal?* But you mean that all this is to be done—how? Not by means of the Church, not by the use of the Holy Sacraments; all this, you have already said, belongs to the first system, which you have set aside, and which every one must give up: "If not, he will be lost!" From such personal faith, "Good Lord deliver us!"

"Reader, this last system is the system which those who are called *evangelical ministers* cleave to and teach." We beg leave to change the italicizing thus: This is the system which those who *are called* evangelical ministers teach. They are called such, nothing more. Never was there any thing more thoroughly unevangelical uttered in the name of the holy Gospel. It is nothing but the old folly of pretending to play Hamlet, with Hamlet's part left out. It is no more like the Gospel, than the serpents of the Egyptian magicians were like the serpents of Moses. Call a pretended Christian system, which finds not only no need for the Church, for the sacraments, for membership in the Church, but feels itself called upon to warn against these as dangerous to evangelical religion—call that "the system of holy Scripture!" There is not an Apostle, a Father, or a Reformer, but who, if called upon, would pronounce it, in the nervous language of the ages of faith, "a damnable heresy."

But enough. Let us cut loose from this miserable caricature of the Christian system, where every sentence only reveals either a misrepresentation, a partial statement of the truth, or some new abomination outright. Let us inquire a little more closely, whether the old Gospel really stands in such antagonism to the Church, and can be so separated from it, as this new evangel would have us believe.

What is the Gospel? It is not merely a series of religious revealed *truths*, separate and apart from the divine *institutions* of grace; but

rather the announcement of the Good News, that Jesus Christ has come, and that He has instituted an order of grace in His Church, by means of which He will save, ever through the Holy Ghost. The Gospel calls men into the Church. It directs them to the Holy Sacraments, not as saviours, but as saving means of the Saviour's grace. (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) The Church and Sacraments are, therefore, not something apart from the Gospel, but are included in it. They are the institutions of grace to which the Gospel directs us. The Gospel is not a teaching, which says that our faith can be the means of our salvation in itself; but it teaches that there is salvation in Christ, which is mediated from Him to us, by means of the Church and its Sacraments, and the institutions of Christ for that end, by the Holy Ghost; and it directs our faith to the use of them. The Gospel announces, that he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and that he who rightly receives and uses the Holy Eucharist is in communion with the body and blood of Christ. (1 Cor. x. 16.)

The Holy Sacraments, as all the Church believes, and has in all ages confessed, are seals which Christ, in and by the Church, applies to our faith for its confirmation and completion. That which needs the confirmation of a seal, is itself insufficient and incomplete without this confirmation. A Deed or Will, for instance, though rightly drawn, is of no account until it is confirmed, completed, and made valid by the sign and seal. Now, should any profess to believe and accept the Gospel, and then refuse to have it confirmed and completed by the sacramental seal of the Church, his faith would thereby declare itself spurious.

The Holy Ghost works faith in the heart, not that it may regard itself as being now in itself sufficient, but for the very purpose of leading the one believing into the communion of Christ and His Church. Had any one of the children of Noah said: "I believe what you announce concerning the destruction of the world, and I expect to be saved by so believing," Noah would have answered: "But you must enter the ark, for the very meaning of what I announce is, that you must enter the ark in order to be saved. Your faith must complete itself, and can only be completed by your act of entering the ark. You believe; but what do you believe? Do you believe that your believing the *words* I utter will save you, or do you believe that the *ark* will save you?" Who does not see, that the very sense and substance of the Good News which Noah preaches is, that those to whom he preaches may be saved, not by his preaching, not by the truth preached, nor yet by their belief in those words of Noah, *but by the ark*, entrance into which is the very act his Gospel requires? It is this very illustration that the Apostle Peter uses to teach, how "baptism doth also now save us." (1 Pet. iii. 21.)

In the same way does the Gospel, proclaimed by Jesus Christ and His Apostles, hold the Gospel and the Sacraments inseparably together, and makes them one gracious and glorious power of God, mutually complementing and completing each other. Thus are the Church and

its Sacraments included in the Gospel as its deepest substance and meaning. He that believes the Gospel, in its true sense, believes also that only in his submission to the Sacraments does his own faith become valid and complete. Just as eating cannot be complete apart from the food to be eaten, even so faith cannot be complete without belief in, and participation of the Holy Sacraments, which are the divine institutions of salvation.

That the Gospel, and true Christian religion, are a thing apart from the Church and the sacramental institutions of Christ, is a fearful error, and one which at this time floats largely in the popular religious mind. The system of salvation constructed by this error, is something like this: God, through His prophets, through His Son, and His apostles, has revealed certain abstract truths to be believed and practiced. These are contained in the sacred Scriptures. These are to be preached to men, so that they may understand and accept them. These truths are such as these: that man is a sinner, that he is not able to save himself, that he must repent and believe in Christ. But man's depraved heart makes him naturally averse to these truths, so that he cannot believe them. Hence the Holy Ghost enables him to believe them, in answer to prayer. When he does believe them, repents of his sins, believes in Christ, prays for the gift of the Spirit, he will be regenerated and saved.

This, in the way of general scheme, is held to be the Gospel; and it is true that, *as far as it goes*, it is the Gospel. So far as it goes, it is all true. We would not *strike out* a single word, but we would *put some more words in*. It is easy to see, that it is not half the Gospel. It leaves out of view, or sets aside the very institutions of Christ, to which it is the main burden of the Gospel to direct sinful and lost men. It reverses the order of the Apostolic commission, putting first what that divine commission puts second. It makes the first, if not the whole of the Gospel to consist in 'teaching them to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded,' 'before it makes disciples of them by baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' It teaches that the Holy Ghost completes the saving work through the word of Christ, and not through the institutions of Christ. It separates what Christ has joined together. It divorces the word of Christ from what He *is*, did, and instituted. It divorces the work of the Spirit from the work and the institutions of Christ. It makes the objective saving powers of salvation a mere spiritual influence, instead of a real divine human presence and mediation, by which Christ truly incorporates us as members in living union with Himself, in the Church, by the sacraments, through the powerful presence and operations of the Holy Ghost. It virtually denies that Jesus Christ so came in the flesh, and so united Himself with humanity, that *He*—and not His Spirit alone—that He, in the Spirit, and by means of His own institutions, is with us always, even to the end of the world. It is, in fact, a Gnostic, Montanistic Gospel, which recognizes only a vague hovering presence of the Spirit and of Christ over the world and humanity, instead of acknow-

ledging that both Christ and the Spirit in the Church, through its ministry and sacramental institutions, have really and perpetually joined themselves with the new-created order of human life, as it has been founded by His Incarnation, and is being carried forward to glorification by the Holy Ghost, in the Church which is the body of Christ, the organ and institution of His perpetual presence and saving power among men, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. (Eph. i. 23.)

What this error teaches, we repeat, is the truth, as far as it goes; but it is error still, because it does not teach the *whole* truth; but at the same time offers this partial truth for the whole Gospel. Half the truth, where it professes to be the whole truth, is a whole error. If I teach a foreigner that to be an American citizen, he must renounce his allegiance to his former nation, respect the laws, pay his taxes, maintain the honor of the government, and in all respects live as a citizen, I teach him, in all this, nothing but what is strictly true. But if he should take this to be the *whole* truth, and expect citizenship upon the ground of what I have taught him alone, he would find what I have told him to be nothing but a grievous lie! While I have told him that all these things are necessary, I have *not* told him that they are all nothing worth unless he is naturalized! I have not told him that this institution of the nation, and this alone, can make all the other claims and qualifications for citizenship valid—that this alone can confirm and complete them, and establish his rights and benefits in them. Hence, while I have told him only truth, by not telling him the whole truth, I have deceived him by a lie!

In like manner, I may teach a man, that to be a member of the family, Church or Kingdom of Jesus Christ, and thus to be saved, he must feel, acknowledge, and confess his sins—that he must repent of and renounce them—that he must accept all the teachings of Christ, and believe them—that he must pray for the help of the Holy Ghost, and the pardon of his sins—and I have told him only truth. And yet, if I tell him no more than this, or leave him under the impression that this is the whole Gospel, I have only cruelly and sinfully deceived him. I have not told him, that he must be baptized, as the only way of becoming a citizen of the Kingdom of Christ. Instead of having directed him to the true Christ, in the Church, I have directed him to a phantom Christ, outside of the Church. Instead of guiding him "into the ark of Christ's Church," in which alone he may be able to "pass the waves of this troublesome world, and so finally come to the land of everlasting life," I have, in fact, only directed him to some abstract, imaginary, phantom-craft, reflected in the deceitful mirage of earth's low grounds—some

> Painted ship
> Upon a painted ocean.

What a mockery—what a caricature of the true, full, and everlasting Gospel which Jesus Christ proclaimed and instituted, is this

other Gnostic dream of a Gospel without a Church, without the institutions of Christ, and without membership in its bosom! The Ancient Creeds, the Reformation Symbols, and, consenting with them, the theology of this Review, stand together as a defiance against this empty foaming sea of popular, but miserable, soul-deceiving, and soul-destroying heresy.

ART. VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Youth in Earnest; as illustrated in the life of Theodore David Fisher, A. M., by *Henry Harbaugh, D.D.*, Prof. of Theology at Mercersburg, Pa. *Philadelphia*: S. R. Fisher & Co., 54 North Sixth street, 1867, pp. 238.

We have read this little book with much interest. Although we were previously acquainted with the main facts which it relates, the manner in which they are brought together, and others with which we were not acquainted, so riveted our attention, that we could not lay it down until we had finished reading the whole interesting, yet sad, narrative. This narrative will, of course, possess a special interest in those circles, in which the subject of the memoir was known and loved; but the title of the book reveals the fact, that the writer supposed it would have also a more general interest, especially for young men. In this we think he has judged wisely. It will serve to remind all of that class who read it, that, by divine grace,

> "They can make their lives sublime,
> And departing leave behind them,
> Foot-prints in the sands of time.
> Foot-prints, that perhaps another,
> Sailing o'er life's solemn main;
> A forlorn and ship-wrecked brother,
> Seeing, shall take heart again."

Youth in Earnest is the title of the book. It presents the narrative of a young man who, in the days of his youth, made solemn earnest with life. This, we think, is the great merit of the book. To the young life usually presents itself in a fictitious light. Consequently they, for the most part, spend the golden period in day dreams which are never realized. Even the piety of youth, as portrayed at least in much of the Sunday School literature of the day, wears this same unreal character. The light reading that so generally falls into the hands of the young is calculated to foster this wrong tendency in their lives. On this account we welcome this book, as being calculated to set before the minds of young men sober and solid views of life.

The theory of religion which it sets forth is of a scriptural and churchly character. Of course it is set forth in the portrayal of a life, but of a life which opened and developed in the Church. There are no over-wrought excitements to narrate. The life of grace un-

folded quietly and gently in the Christian family and the Church, until it stood forth in the strength of Christian manhood. There it ended so far as this world is concerned, but we know that it is only transferred to another and a better sphere.

> "Life is real! Life is earnest!
> And the grave is not its goal;
> Dust thou art, to dust returnest,
> Was not spoken of the soul."

We commend this book for general circulation. Every Christian family would find a benefit in placing it in the hands of their children. It ought to find a place in our Sunday School libraries. No doubt there are other biographies among Sunday School books, whether of real or fictitious persons, which might at first attract the attention more than this, but we doubt whether they, as a general thing, will leave so many valuable lessons to ponder, and so healthful an influence on the heart.

We need only add, that it is written in Dr. Harbaugh's usual interesting style, and gotten up in good taste by our Printing House in Philadelphia. A.

A Funeral Discourse, delivered in St. Peter's German Reformed Church, North Wales, Pa., October 22d, 1866, on the occasion of the death (funeral?) of the *Rev. Samuel Helffenstein, D.D.:* By J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D., pp. 24.

If we were to follow our taste and feeling in the matter, we would pass this sermon by with the single announcement of the title. And even after the notice we have taken of it had been substantially written, we thought we had several times disposed of it by returning it to the drawer. But duty to God, to the truth, and to the Church is not to be performed in that way. The sermon not only begins with an attack upon a vital truth clearly and repeatedly endorsed by the Church,—the priestly element in the Christian ministry—but also closes with a direct, open, and formal attack upon what is called, "Mercersburg Theology." When a charge is brought against *Mercersburg* Theology, the *Mercersburg* Review, has not only a right, but self-respect requires of it to answer for itself. To this may be added the fact, that at least one of the more intelligent hearers of the discourse has informed us, that if the views in regard to the transfer of the functions of the Levitical priesthood into the Christian Church, as intimated in the Sermon, are held in the Church, or any part of it, either directly or by any kind of implication, it is not difficult to see on which side the truth lies. Others who heard the Sermon, and still others who read it, will, of course, get the same impression. The Review is thus bound to take notice of an attack wholly unprovoked, and voluntarily made upon the views it is set to defend. With the author of the sermon we never have had, and never intend to have, any per-

sonal quarrel, but with his publicly expressed views on the subject in hand—ever!

Dr. Helffenstein was the oldest minister in the German Reformed Church in this country. He was upwards of 90 years old when he died, and had been 70 years a minister. As he died during the time the Eastern Synod was in session at York, that body was prompt in doing honor to so remarkable a minister. Its beautiful action may be found in the Minutes, p. 35. The main events of his life are rehearsed; after which, the paper, drawn up by the venerable D. Willers, bears testimony to his love for, and interest in the Church and her institutions, which he "continued to manifest, even to the end of his long life. Of this he gave special tangible evidence, by his liberal contributions in connection with the Tercentenary celebration of the Heidelberg Catechism in 1863." To this may be added the fact, that he attended both the conventions held in connection with the Tercentenary Festal Year, at Philadelphia, in January, 1863, and at Reading in May, 1864, and manifested great interest in its objects and purposes. At Reading especially he seemed to renew his youth, and under the inspiration of the great occasion, he expressed to us with emotion the joy he felt in the fact, that this great movement in the Church was bringing out its true genius and spirit; and to this remark he added another, in which he referred with deep sadness to a certain unfortunate matter, with which he might appear to some to be associated, on account of his peculiar relation to the parties concerned, and repudiated the idea, that he had ever even connived at the defection, or was at heart, or in any other way, identified with it. He was with the Church against any and all croakers and traducers.

The author of this Sermon, being at Synod, received an invitation from the friends to attend the funeral and conduct the solemn services on that occasion. After the above action of Synod, including two Resolutions giving honor to his memory and condoling with the relatives, had been passed, the author of this sermon rose and stated, in substance, that though it was a delicate matter for him to suggest, as he had been invited to attend the funeral and would, of course, go. Yet it seemed to him due to the memory of the deceased and to the Synod, that he should, in some way, be authorized to go as from the Synod, and thus to represent the body at the funeral. It was then "*Resolved*, That the Rev. Dr. Bomberger, the Rev. N. Gehr, and the Rev. J. G. Wiehle be commissioned to bear the above action to the family of the deceased, and represent this body at the funeral services, on next Monday." (Min. p. 86.) Thus this matter of representing the Synod fell into the hands of the author of this Sermon, who was Chairman.

We are not informed in the prefatory note, that the beautiful action of Synod was read, either publicly or privately, though this was, no doubt, done. The author, as "commissioned" by Synod "to represent the body at the funeral," will, no doubt, report at the next meeting of Synod. Though the propriety of the occasion made it necessary, of

course, that the greater part of the discourse should be devoted to a review of the long and illustrious life of the deceased, yet the commissioner of Synod did not fail—as might be supposed from his desire to have the appointment—to bring in the body which he was representing, and the Church over which that body is the divinely constituted guardian. As this Sermon is not, therefore, a mere private publication, but that of one commissioned by Synod "to represent that body at the funeral services," it has more than ordinary public interest. How the Church was thus represented by its own official, it may therefore be interesting to set forth so far as it can be done from the published sermon of the delegate.

This solemn duty was performed by Synod's commissioner, by, first of all, devoting the first part of the sermon to the continuation of a discussion, in which he had just been engaged in Synod, as to the priestly element in the holy ministry. To understand this controversy, it is proper to state that this was one of the points which entered into the discussion on the Liturgy at York. The author of this Sermon contended before that body, that there was in no sense a priestly element in the Christian ministry, and that as this element was recognized in the Liturgy, it ought not to be adopted by Synod. Others took the opposite side, but failed to convince him. Hence it was necessary to discuss this subject farther at the funeral of Dr. Helffenstein. That he really discussed this point before the mourners, in view of the interest it had created before Synod, is evident from the sermon itself. At the close of the discussion of this point, he says: "Apart from the intrinsic importance of this point—an interest intensified by some *alarming recent manifestations*, I feel fully justified in having thus enlarged upon it here, because the views advanced *are believed to have been* those of our departed father." He *knew* that these were not the views of those who contended against him at Synod; he does *not* know, surely, that they are the views held by Dr. Helffenstein, but they "are believed," by some parties unknown, to have been his. Nor is it necessary that he should know, for he is not commissioned in his present position by the deceased, but by Synod. He knows what was there held, and with that he has now to do as its delegate.

It is true, there, might seem to be some impropriety in bringing this discussion before a new jury, and especially one composed in great part of mourners and sympathising friends; but we must remember that there is a generally accepted authority which says—"*De gustibus non est disputandum.*" With the taste of the matter, then, we must not quarrel. A commissioner must do his duty, without even consulting his own taste.

But then how was this duty performed? To answer this question it is necessary to make *three* points: *First*, we must see how he represents the views of his opponents in Synod; *secondly*, how he states his own views as differing from theirs; and *thirdly*, how he at last agrees with those who differ from him. Let it not, for a moment, be thought that these three things are contradictory in his mind.

1. What his opponents at Synod held is not *directly* stated; but is to be gathered from intimations and deprecating terms and phrases. We may get the true canon of interpretation thus: The idea of the priestly element in the Christian ministry, which he opposes, is the one he regards as held by the other side. We must, therefore, carefully note what he says the Christian ministry *is not*, then that is what his opponents hold that it is. For certainly, a Commissioner of Synod would not represent that body, or any part of it, by putting up a man of straw, and then fight that down! Thus, then, our way is clear.

The Sermon had, of course, also to represent its text. This is found 1 Sam. iv., 13, where Eli, a high-priest—whose "great fault," as Calmet informs us, "was his negligence, and his indulgence of his sons, who were sons of Belial"—sat by the way-side trembling for the ark. The Sermon proposes, "Amidst all the incidental diversities which the lives of these two patriarchs exhibit," to trace the "deeper analogies" between them. Eli "was a priest." The deceased "was not, like Eli, a *priest* in the peculiar official sense of that title." This is the first deeper analogy. The author's opposers, therefore, hold that he was. "There is no place under the Christian dispensation, and in the true Apostolic Gospel Church on earth, for a separate specific sacerdotal office. . . . . With the one great and perfect sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross, all the functions of *such* a priesthood came to an end." His Synodical opposers, therefore, hold that the functions of the Old Testament priesthood did not come to an end, when Christ made his offering once for all! "His priesthood, in its peculiar propitiatory sense, like that of its significant prototype Melchisedec, allowed of no successors, as though His work of atonement had been left incomplete, and needed supplementary human sacerdotal aids." His opposers, of course, hold that Christ's work of atonement was not made complete by Him, but must be supplemented! He holds that Christ's work of atonement was made complete by Him. "To assert or maintain the contrary," as his opposers do, "involves an impious assumption, and casts a derogatory reflection upon the Divine sufficiency of His atonement." Of this his opposers are guilty! "Now, therefore, there remains nothing in the Church on earth, specifically belonging to the ancient office, for a human priest to do." His opposers hold that what "specifically belonged to the ancient office," still remains for the Christian ministry to do—that is, they hold that the peculiar offerings of the ancient priesthood are still in place. This point he makes still clearer afterwards, when we are informed that, "although he (the deceased) was not, and discarded the thought of being, a *priest*, in a specific official sense, he was, in an evangelical view, more than an Aaronic priest, or Levitical offerer of typical sacrifices." His opposers hold that he was not! "He might not be *Eli's* official successor; but he was *St. Paul's*." His opponents hold that his ministry was not after St. Paul's, but after Eli's! "He might not boast of authority to offer sacrifices of bulls and goats,

whose blood could never take away sins, or make those who offer them perfect." This must have at least startled even his sad audience, whose minds, we may well suppose, must have been somewhat in danger, amid the solemnity of the occasion, of wandering on other subjects. Has it indeed come to this in our Reformed Church, they would say, that men "boast," that they have "authority to offer the sacrifice of bulls and goats?' But can this be? Why not? Is not the preacher fighting some opponents who hold the views which he controverts? Has he not just been standing up in Synod against these views; and has he not given us warning in the very beginning, that the reason why he feels fully justified at this first public opportunity—even though it be at a funeral—to take up this matter is, that "the intrinsic importance of this point" pressed just at this very time, when the interest it has is "intensified by some alarming recent manifestations." He is evidently fighting some errorists; and who can they be but the ones, who hold views on this subject which "involve an impious assumption."

To make it doubly clear to his afflicted audience, that his opponents in the discussion at Synod aim at nothing less than a restoration of the "ancient office" of the "the priesthood, in its peculiar propitiatory sense," he gives them the following, as the powerful closing *ergo*: "How far, therefore, must the Gospel ministry of reconciliation be acknowledged to surpass the loftiest pretensions of the *ancient Levitical priesthood, or of any modern imitation of it*, in all the essential qualities and powers of its spiritual functions." Yet this kind of Gospel ministry it is, that the "alarming recent manifestations" are about to displace, by this "ancient Levitical priesthood," or at least some "modern imitation of it." *Ohe! jam satis*! For one we go with Synod's Commissioner on this point. We are decidedly opposed to the restoration of the ancient Levitical priesthood, or any modern imitation of it.

2. We come to the second point. How he states his views, as differing from his opponents. Here the material is more scarce, and this point may be more briefly made clear. This lack of data for positive views is easily explained. It is the duty of a controversialist to *deny*—to demolish the views, or supposed views of others; and it is especially easy to be conceived how a man so terribly pursued by "alarming recent manifestations," as to make him "tremble for the ark"—even at a funeral—might be much confused in regard to his own views, or perhaps even forget whether he had any. Besides, it may sometimes perhaps be a comfort, even to mourners, to know simply what they are *not* to believe.

But Synod could certainly not be properly and fully represented, if the Commissioner did not at least hint at what is to be believed on the subject in hand. Let us see whether we cannot get some points. (Hear.) "In the sense in which all the members of the Christian Church are made kings and priests unto God, the minister of the New Testament is indeed a priest." In no sense different from other members

of the Church! That is a positive view, and clearly stated. But to make it plainer, he adds: "He partakes of their common anointing, that so he may confess the name of Christ, and *present himself* a living *sacrifice of thankfulness* to Him." This is undoubtedly true, just as the catechism has it. That the minister is also a member of the church is an old truth; but that the member is also a minister, is new. But we are distinctly told that this is so. He has, in fact, nothing in this respect, different from other members. In the service of the sanctuary, though "he leads and directs the people in these *common acts of worship*," yet it is only because "as a member he is permitted to *participate*" in their "*common* priesthood." But the reader must have the benefit of this precious passage entire. "In the sense, therefore, also in which there is in the Church an altar, on which sacrifices of gratitude and praise are to be continually offered unto God through Jesus Christ, he presents himself statedly with the congregation of the Lord before such an altar, and offers with penitential humility and joyful faith such sacrifices. Nay, he leads and directs the people in these common acts of worship and thankfulness. But not as separate and distinct from them by virtue of any official sacerdotal prerogatives; not as filling a specific priesthood, beyond and above that of the Holy Catholic Church, of which he is a member, and in whose common priesthood he is permitted to participate."

For a long time we could not imagine what the author could mean by the singular phrase, "beyond and above the holy Catholic Church," but at length we saw it. The "holy Catholic Church" is the members. The meaning then is, that the minister is *not* to be regarded "as filling a specific priesthood" above and beyond what belongs to all the members, "in whose common priesthood he is permitted to participate." This also agrees with the passage before quoted, that "the minister of the New Testament is, indeed, a priest," but only "in the sense in which all the members of the Christian Church" are priests. If this is not a plain and positive denial of the Divine authority of ministerial ordination in the Church, as setting apart and divinely commissioning an order of men for the special ministry of God's house, what is it? We are sure, that the author of this sermon will earnestly deprecate the idea of his holding such views. We have only to do with what he here publicly teaches; and we see here to what miserable shifts he allows himself to be driven to maintain false premises. Why does he take this extreme and untenable ground? Not that he may demolish the Levitical priesthood and the ancient Jewish idea of sacrifices, which he ridiculously persists in charging upon his brethren; for he knows well enough how that man of straw can readily be brought down by the very view of the ministry which those hold whom he fights; but he takes this extreme ground because he knows equally well, that the view of the ministry, which regards it as a truly divinely instituted office, which in its very nature is a ministry of God, mediating between God and men, as the stewardship of God's mysteries, as these are graciously at hand and administered in

the Holy Sacraments—that such a ministry, which has in it the prophetic, priestly, and kingly functions, as these were typical in the Old but fulfilled in the New Testament—he knows, we say that such a view of the ministry cannot be set aside except by a denial, that there is a ministry, in any sense at all, except "in the sense in which all the members of the Church" have it. This ground he, therefore, fears not boldly to take.

3. We have yet to show how he at last agrees with those who differ from him. How can this be? We freely confess we hardly know how it can be; but we know it can be because it actually is so. The document speaks for itself. Hear:

"He (the deceased) filled an *office invested* in its moral and spiritual character, with deeper and higher significance, (than the Aaronic priesthood,) and *through which*, by its *peculiar* functions, *that grace* which bringeth salvation *reached out* upon the world with far greater power and influence." Here we are informed, that the ministry is an *office* of a character above the priesthood of Aaron; which Aaronic office, the priesthood certainly did not hold in common with unordained members of the Jewish Church; nor can it be said that members of the Christian Church are in office. We are farther told, that this office has "*peculiar* functions." What functions has the Christian ministry above "a member, in whose common priesthood he is permitted to participate," if his office does not invest him with an authority above those who are simply members of the Church? And what is there "*peculiar*" about these functions, if it be not something which belongs not to a member of the Church? We are farther told, that "*through*" this office, "*by its peculiar functions*, that *grace* which bringeth salvation" *reaches out* upon the world. If this is not mediation between God and men through men invested with office, and by the peculiar functions of that office, what is? If that which is *peculiar* in this office and its functions is not the grace-bearing authority to preach the gospel, and the power of administering the sacraments, which members of the Church are not authorized to do for themselves, what is the peculiarity? If this is *not* a peculiarity of the office, then any member, "in whose common priesthood he is permitted to participate," may baptize and administer the Holy Supper as well as he. It is this very *peculiarity* of this mediating *office*, which those, whom this author here *truly* "represents," hold to be a most solemn and sacred prerogative of the Christian ministry. Nothing less, and nothing more, but only and precisely this. Here, then, the Commissioner at last "represents the body" which authorized him to go in its name. "All is well that ends well."

The "alarming recent manifestations," with which the sermon begins, haunted the representative of Synod more or less to the end of his sermon. Some feeble half depressed "tremblings for the ark," attack him occasionally all along; but near the end he is once more violently siezed, and the trembling rises into a shudder. It is occasioned by a strange and alarming vision "of distress and apprehension

for the safety and prosperity of the Church," from "*the rise and spread of that system of doctrine and church-life distinctively known as Mercersburg Theology*," passing before his mental eye. This ill-boding Raven "from the night's Plutonian shore," puts his "beak into his heart," and "casts its form" upon the funeral floor; and he is sure that "trembling for the ark must continue till the issue of the conflict is reached."

Our notice of this Funeral Sermon, having already grown beyond the length designed, we take no further notice of the *assertion* on page 21, that "the rise and spread of that system of doctrine and church-life distinctively known as Mercersburg Theology," was to Dr. Helffenstein in his later years a "cause of distress and apprehension for the safety and prosperity of his Church," except to recall to the reader's mind our own *assertion* made at the beginning of this notice, that, at the Tercentenary Convention at Reading in 1864, he was full of joy, amounting to positive enthusiasm, at this very movement as it then flowered and fruited in the results of that grand occasion. We not only *assert* that he then approved of "the spread of that system of doctrine," but that he positively, unequivocally, plainly, and directly disowned and condemned the old Berg and Co. opposition to it, and he did all this with all that feeling of sadness, which must ever be natural to an aged father, whose convictions compel him to perform duty, when he dare even not "confer with flesh and blood!" This *we* assert and one *assertion* is as good as another, other things being equal. Whether these other things are equal or not, our readers alone have a right to decide. But we must say, that it seems to us weak—if nothing worse—to attempt to take up Dr. Helffenstein by the side of his own grave, where he can answer no more, and set him over against views held by the Synod of the Church which Dr. Helffenstein loved, and which it has over and over endorsed, and never a single time disowned—and to do this in the face of his love for the Church, and her institutions exhibited to the last by his bequests, among which is one of $500 for Beneficiary Education, that is, the education of young men in the very institutions in which he knew "that system of doctrine distinctively known as Mercersburg Theology," is taught, and which views, we are told, he had made his "careful study"—it seems to us weak, we say, in the face of all this substantial testimony of his own acts looking all the other way, to claim him for the other side, on a mere wavering assertion made here, and especially in the first part of his sermon, which even the author himself disowns in fact by putting it in this form: "The views advanced *are believed* to have been those of our departed Father!" Has this any more weight than the words of her who goeth about the streets carrying startling news, which she prefaces always, and only with the indefinite: "*They* say!"

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1867.

Art. I.—THE APOSTOLIC COMMISSION.

BY REV. S. N. CALLENDER, A. M., GREENCASTLE, PA.

"I am come that they might have life."—(John x. 10.) By this and similar utterances in the word of God, we are taught the ultimate design of Christ's mission into the world. This comprehends vastly more than that conception which sees no deeper meaning in His incarnation, than a suitable adaptation to His work, as the Teacher of the children of men, and the Atoner for their sins. Such a view involves a low and inadequate conception of the nature of sin and its terrible consequences. It would seem to regard Adam, as he stood in Eden before the fall, as in the enjoyment of all the franchises of his being originally included in the mind of his Creator; as being already a participant in the grace of life, for which he was then but a candidate, to be enjoyed only, in the event of his free self-determination admitting him unto the wonderfully mysterious Sacrament of the Tree of Life; that his relations to the surroundings in the midst of which he was placed, were in no other way affected by his sin, than simply having incurred the divine displeasure, he thereby made himself obnoxious to punishment; and that to restore him in full to his normal relations to God, to himself, and to the whole order of nature around him, required only that this penalty should be endured, either in his own person or in the person of a Mediator. Sin, for it,

is a misdemeanor simply, calling indeed for suitable chastisements, but in no way effecting the organic relations of the creature to the Creator. It has no power to see in it, a complete prevention of man's right relations to God—a fearful bar against that holy vital union, by which the human and divine were designed to be bound together in harmonious accord. It apprehends not the derangement of man's inner being—the displacement of his moral and spiritual joints, and his helpless defection from allegiance to the laws of his own constitution. Neither does it see the terrific disorganization of all the normal relations subsisting between himself, as the conscious head, and the whole world of nature around him. This view fails to comprehend this universal derangement and disorganization. It sees not in sin the cause of man's failure to attain to his full normal relations to God as the ground and source of life. It sees him not thus cut off—hurled from the proper orbit of his being—cast down beneath the wreck of his own nature, and overwhelmed in the abyss of death. The wages of sin is, not simply punishment, the endurance of pain, but all this, and ten thousand times more, *it is death;* which the view spoken of, fails to comprehend.

The incarnation of the Logos, held in a far deeper necessity, than simply to endow humanity with the dignity and power of endurance, necessary to satisfy the demands of a broken law. It was indeed, necessary even for this partial end. For to satisfy the claims of divine justice, the same nature that sinned, must suffer the penalty of its sin, and this, man could not do in his own unaided strength.* But if the incarnation was to subserve no more far-reaching purpose, than to cancel by the sufferings of its subject, the penal obligations of mankind, then as soon as this end was accomplished, there would seem to be no farther reason for its continuance. And it is not easy to see why God might not in some way, bring the union, in this special form, to an end. It would seem to involve an expenditure far greater than the necessities in the case demanded, and

* Heidelberg Catechism, Quest. 16.

to entail relations, which neither party subsequently needed. This, we can by no means admit. The hinderances in the way of man's elevation to his right relations of being, were not merely negative, which required only strength enough to remove them out of the way, that he might thenceforth pursue the original and normal course of his being without further help. The trouble in his case, in addition to this, was the want of the positive element. And this is what must be provided for, as the deepest ground and necessity for the incarnation. It must not only provide for man's deliverance from hell, but it must also raise him up to heaven; it must not only obviate the necessity of suffering, but must elevate him to the estate of positive happiness and life.

All this must the incarnation include for man, if it would raise him out of the abyss of death, and by linking his nature in a *vital* union with the divine, secure to him the blessing of everlasting life. And only by this vital union was there any possibility of bestowing this blessing upon him. For it is not, and never was, designed by the Creator, that man should have life *in himself*. But only as he stood in vital union with His own being as the absolute ground and source of all life. To be out of, and separated from God, *is to be dead*. To be in union with Him, *is to have life*. Hence we can see the necessity for the permanency of the incarnation. It was not to serve a temporary, transient interest, but to open up to fallen man the possibility of attaining the original idea of his being.

In what *form* the union of the human and divine would have taken place, had not sin entered into the world, it is not necessary for us here to inquire. It is enough to know that it would have taken place. The incarnation must not be regarded as an after-thought on the part of God; as an addition to the original plan of creation. It was no happy expedient, wisely devised, to save from defeat and failure the whole original purpose; and an intertwining of relations which otherwise would have been unnecessary. There was no miscalculation in the divine reckonings, which the presence of sin for the first time revealed. Neither is it necessary for us to admit,

that the *fact* of sin was originally included as an integer in the counsels of eternity. On the contrary, we feel bound to hold, that a plan, devised in infinite wisdom, involving boundless resource and unerring knowledge, must comprehend all possibilities but failure; and while it affords them room for full play, yet it towers infinitely above their ability to defeat or overthrow. All things *must* conspire together for its appointed consummation. Whatever of opposition may reveal itself, whether from without or within, will find itself fully provided for, without the calling in of any additional resource. These hinderances may, whether seemingly or really, retard the operation of the plan, or may necessitate different lines of procedure, still must it ever move onward, overcoming all opposition, assimilating what may be assimilated, and casting out all that may not be appropriated. The union of the human and divine, was originally involved in the plan of creation, as its ultimate design and end, and in this union as it holds in the Person of Jesus Christ, do we find the revelation of God's will, touching this precise interest. "Having made known unto us the *mystery of His will*, according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed in Himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in one, *all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in Him.*" (Eph. i. 9, 10.)

The appearance of sin, as a disturbing force, growing out of man's free self-determining power, was confronted immediately, by this very resource for its effectual overthrow. It had the power to derange and retard, and to bring man under the dominion and condemnation of death. But in the outworkings of the divine plan, it was found too impotent to maintain the supremacy it asserted, and was compelled to surrender up the captivity, it at first seemed so effectually to have made. Notwithstanding this irruption of the evil power into the plan of creation, it was not prevented from moving forward towards its consummation. This, as we have learned from St. Paul, consisted in the gathering together of all things, both in heaven and on earth, in the Person of Jesus Christ.

In due time, we have the revelation of this mystery. The Logos, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, and the free consent of the Virgin Mary, enters into the world. In this wonderful birth, we behold the second Person of the Adorable Trinity in vital union with humanity. He taking upon Himself our nature, not simply as an individual, to stand forth as *one* in the midst of the teeming race of Adam, as a single branch of the wide-spreading tree, but grasping the very foundations of our human existence, He appropriates it to Himself as the generic force and life of our race. Not *a* man, but *the* man. The second Adam, like unto the first, as the bearer of the totality of our humanity, comprehending in His Person the *whole* of our human life. As there was treasured up in Him, on the one hand, the fulness of the Godhead, so on the other, was there gathered up in Him, all the fulness of humanity. Not humanity in one of its phases, more or less defective, presenting some of its features with greater, others with less prominence and faithfulness to its ideal; but in Him, the perfection of all its proportions, the actualization of its grand ideal, in all its powers and attributes. And these too, not merely as subjective qualities, as they hold independent of our outward relations, as forces merely of our inner life. But all these in the forms in which they reveal themselves in the way of outward activities, in our relations to the spiritual world, to our fellowmen, and to the world of nature beneath us. For man is man in the proper sense of the term, only as his life reveals itself in the outward form of the institutions and relations in which it becomes actual in the world. The family, the state, learning in all its departments, the arts, the sciences, and all monuments besides of the activity of the human soul, stand not apart from, but are truly comprehended in the constitution of our human life.

These departments, if we may so call them, and all others besides, comprehended thus in the wonderful constitution of our humanity, *must* come at last to a vital union with the divine. Failure in this, is failure equally deep and disastrous in the purpose of its being, it is death. But attaining this, is to at-

tain to life and immortality. It was in this comprehensive sense, that the Logos apprehended our nature, and took it into union with His Divinity. These are the "all things which are on earth," which the divine will would gather up in Christ, "even in Him," of which St. Paul speaks.

Sin, however, had plunged humanity into a state of disorganization, and overwhelmed it with the power of death. But this terrible catastrophe had no power to prevent its union with the divine, as already provided for in the counsels of eternity. There was ample room left for its consummation under circumstances different indeed, than otherwise would have attended it, but in no way affecting its original necessity and possibility. Only must this erring interest be pursued into the desert of its alienation, and apprehended in the midst, and under the weight of, all its incurred penalties. Hence the Logos descended into the world, as it lay under the power of sin, and in a free and natural way took it into union with Himself.

This union, however, had not the effect immediately, to relieve humanity from the pains and penalties which it had incurred. These had come upon it, not in the way of accident or helpless misfortune. The powers of darkness had not overwhelmed it as with a flood, bearing down all its powers of resistance, and overpowering its will and free choice. It was not the *power* of the devil, that wrought the mischief, but his *instigation.* It was this last, insidiously and deceitfully addressed to man, that induced his free-will to decide against his allegiance to God, and reject the terms of life. This, of course, involved guilt. And while on the one hand, it overwhelmed him with the pains and miseries of disorganization, on the other, it brought down upon him the wrath of divine justice. These solemn interests, fearful indeed to the prostrate victim, might not be set aside without due respect to their righteousness and necessity, as holding in the mind of God, and as a consequence, equally so in man's constitution. It was not possible then for Christ, having become incarnate, to deliver man from all his penal obligations to the law, by the exercise simply of divine power. Just as we may seize hold upon the condemned cul-

prit, and violently deliver him from the hands of justice. That would have been to array divine power against divine justice, introducing conflicts into the Godhead; a thing totally impossible and equally inconceivable. While the justice of God did not stand in the way of the union in the incarnation, it nevertheless required that its just claims must all be fairly met and satisfied, and only then could it consent that man should be fully admitted to the glorious Sacrament of life, for which, from the first he was intended.

Hence the necessity that our Redeemer should become "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;" that He should plunge to the deepest depth of human misery, and feel the keenest pang of every pain. He must experience in His Body, the pains entailed by man's disobedience, and in His Soul, must He endure the terrific weight of His Father's wrath against sin. He must bow His head to the very powers of death, and enter its dark portals. He must realize the sunderance of soul and body, and penetrate the shades of Hades. In a word, He must follow out the fearful road marked out by sin, and endure its direst penalty. And having drunk that bitter cup to its bitterest dregs, then only were man's sins satisfied for, and the wrath of God appeased.

But more than all this was necessary. He may not remain under the power of death, or all must end in failure, and afford no effectual deliverance *from* its dominion. If it is strong enough to hold Him, with Him will it ever hold the whole race of Adam. He must not only suffer death, but it needs that He overcome and conquer it. And having fulfilled all the purposes of His humiliation, must the mighty energies of His divine-human life burst asunder the bonds of his captivity, like a strong man throws off the frail fetters of sleep, leading captive to His own will, and in His blessed Person, the captivity He thus rescued from its prison-house. This too, He did. And presented before Heaven, Earth and Hell, the actual living fact, which He had previously announced to the afflicted Martha of Bethany, of "the resurrection and the life," as comprehended in Himself.

It was from this exalted eminence of triumph and conquest,—

comprehending in His life, as God, all the powers of the heavenly world, and as Man, all things on earth, that He announces to His Apostles, and through them to the whole world, for all time, the establishment of His supernatural Kingdom, in that soul-thrilling proclamation, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." (St. Matt. xxviii. 18.)

Just here is it necessary to guard against that imagination, so wide-spread in our day, that this Kingdom, being *Spiritual*, has no concrete actual existence as such, in the world. That with our Lord's ascension into heaven, all real substantial union of the human and divine ceased upon earth. That it left man in pretty much the same relation to the order of nature, as under the dominion of the powers of darkness, as he stood in before, only with this difference; that in the enjoyment of new moral and spiritual *influences*, it became possible for him to be *accounted* righteous, *because* of what Christ had done. That the only union with the divine now attainable for him, is a certain indefinable inhabitation of his person by the Holy Ghost. That since Christ's final disappearance as the God-man, from the earth, the Holy Spirit had come to dwell, and exercise His heavenly powers in some mysterious way among men, different indeed from what He had done before the incarnation, death and resurrection of Christ, but still in an unmediated and direct way. That His gracious approaches to us are not through and in the union holding in the Person of Christ, but only *on account* of it, as an outside consideration. That the effect of this apprehension of the human soul by the Holy Spirit, in the way of power and influence, is to change its moral disposition and spiritual relations, so as to place it in a saving relation to the merits of Christ; and that its subsequent history in the world, becomes accordingly modified and shaped. Such a soul is a Christian, according to this view, standing separate and alone, and the whole multitude of such separate Christians throughout the world, taken collectively, constitute the Church on earth. There is indeed a bond of union between them, but this exists only in the fact, that the same Holy Spirit, the third Person in the Trinity, holds this same *guestship*, in the heart of each one.

No thought, of course, is entertained, that His indwelling in the believer, comes to a real hypostatical union with his life, so as to make as many incarnations of the Spirit, as there are separate Christians. It is only a kind of inhabitation of some sort. And inasmuch as there is no room in this view, for a real, actual participation of the believer in the incarnation of Christ, all the objective powers of Christianity become simply spiritual forces to act upon and influence his heart and life. The Church is for it, nothing more than an aggregation of individuals, having no supernatural constitution, destitute of inherent power to appropriate the material of the world, and transform it into its own image, but can take it up, only as it is transformed into this image beforehand. The announcement of our arisen Lord, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," is for it, no proclamation of a Kingdom. It is only a word of comfort and assurance, to encourage the Apostles to go forth upon their arduous mission, confident of success.

Now against this grossly mistaken view, must we carefully guard, if we would not at once, rule the Church out of its place in the Creed. As just described, it is not, and cannot be an article for faith. It is but a mere doctrine for the understanding. And it is entitled to be called the Body of Christ at all, only in a figurative sense, as comprehending the aggregate of the individuals who have come to be benefited by His sufferings and death. Its supernatural constitution, as a living actual organism in the world, comprehending the *human*, no less than the divine life of our Lord Jesus Christ, is fairly excluded. As such, together with the whole habit of theological thought, in which this conception stands, we unhesitatingly pronounce it to be wrong and false. It is the baldest kind of Rationalism.

The Church, for faith, is an objective *fact* in the world. Not an *abstraction*, as depending upon the multitude of individuals, each contributing its common feature or characteristic to the formation of the generality, but a *concrete* general life, which stands anterior in the order of thought to the individual, and by its own inherent force infuses itself into the individual,

making him like unto itself, and comprehending him in its own constitution. It is not an aggregation of trunk, limbs, branches and twigs, out of which, in thought, we undertake to construct a tree; but rather the vital principle first of all, the fruitful germ, in the exercise of whose inherent powers, it apprehends the outward material, and by the force of its own plasticity transforms it into its own kind, and animates it with its own life. Christ is this vital germ, enfolding in His own Person, humanity in its totality; that is, including all its powers and potentialities, in living union with His divine nature. In the *fact* of this, holds the fact of life (*ζωὴ*)* for humanity. Apart from this union, it is in a state of separation from the fountain of all life, it is in death (*θάνατος*). Our humanity is then germinally in the Person of Christ in a state of life, just as it was germinally present in the person of Adam in a state of death. The life of Adam developed itself in a natural way, and has filled, and continues to fill the world with its fruit. And it requires no labored reflection to comprehend what is meant when we speak of the human race as his natural *body*. It is the natural outgrowth of his generic life, which as a moulding, plastic force,

---

* "As to the idea of *ζωή* itself; it belongs to the most profound things in the profound language of John. For it designates the only real absolute *Being* (the *ὄντως εἶναί*) of Deity, in contrast with the relative *existence* of the creature. The latter, contemplated as in isolation from God, is in *θάνατος*, and only has its *ζωή* in connection with God, the fountain of life. God is therefore *ὁ μόνος ἔχων τὴν ἀθανασίαν* (1 Tim. vi. 16); creatures receive it only through conjunction with Him; and inasmuch as God communicates it to them through the Logos, Christ is called *ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν* (Colos. iii. 4). For as He contains the life in Himself (*ὁ ζῶν*, Rev. i. 18), so also He imparts it (*ὁ ζωοποιῶν*)."

"In order to a thorough apprehension of the idea of *ζωή*, it is important to consider the term *θάνατος* in its biblical usage. In reference to creatures, it has a twofold sense. It commonly signifies the *becoming separate* of things belonging together, either of the soul and body in physical death, or of the spirit and the soul in the inward, spiritual or eternal death. But *θάνατος* also designates *that which separates*, the power that produces death. (Rev. xx. 14.) While, therefore, death is the unharmonizing force which checks individual life in its development, and destroys it, the *ζωή* appears as the harmonious strengthening power, which renders life all congenial. Thus as life stands on a parallel with *good*, so does death with *evil*. The former only is the eternal and absolute; the latter, like evil, is not any thing substantial, still less any thing absolute, but yet something *real*—viz., the destruction of the proper relation, and the cause of this destruction."—OLSHAUSEN.

makes the individual what he is, without any forethought or contribution on his part. Just so does the life of Christ develop itself, constituting an outward body, only in a spiritual way.

But it will be borne in mind that Christ's was not a new humanity, a creation *de novo*. His was Adam's humanity as under the power of the curse. He was born of his race, under the law, appropriating to Himself his nature by the force of a new *spiritual* creation. Here did He open up the possibility of a new spiritual birth, just as under the old order, was the natural. The development of this divine human life, begetting spiritual sons and daughters, is the gradual extension of the life of Christ, and to the same extent the formation of His mystical Body, the Church. And just as new sons and daughters are being constantly born unto the life of Adam, through the medium of the human family, his Body, so are there new children born day by day unto the life of Christ, not immediately by the creative energy of the Holy Spirit, but mediately, by this same heavenly Power, through the Body of Christ, the Church, the Mother of us all. Not spiritually born outside of this body, and outside of its life, and then counted as a child unto her, but born of this body, receiving life from her as our true spiritual Mother.

Hence it is easy for *faith* to see that we stand in the midst of the workings of this divine organism. That the life of the God-man, is imminent *here* in this world. And that too, no less human than divine. That it is not shut up and concluded within the limits of His glorified body in Heaven, but that as a perennial stream it flows onward in His visibile Body on earth to the end of time.

Moreover, we must bear in mind that the humanity of Christ, is, and necessarily must be, co-extensive with Adam's. Its remedial powers must be commensurate with the ruins of the fall, and reveal themselves wherever these effects are to be found. We look, therefore, for these regenerating and sanctifying potencies in every department of human life. The Family, the State, our social relations in all their phases, Art, Sci-

ence, Learning, and all the outward revelations of human powers, are gathered up in this supernatural constitution, and only now as they come to be leavened with its heavenly life, and transformed into its image, is it possible for them to realize their mission, and be saved from final and disastrous overthrow. These "all things in earth," were gathered up and completed in the Person of Christ, and the mission of the Church on earth is to carry forward this germinal realization, to an actual development in the world. The Powers of the world to come, are therefore something vastly more than an influence, a moral force, even though plied by a spiritual and divine efficiency.

It was thought necessary to say thus much upon the meaning and design of the incarnation of our Lord, and the constitution and powers of His Holy Body the Church, before it would be possible to arrive at a just estimate of the contents of the Apostolic Commission, and the powers therein conferred upon its bearers, as well as the spiritual appliances placed in their hands for the accomplishment of their mission. All this is necessarily involved in the subject. For we may not speak of resources being at hand in the Church, and powers to be exercised by the Ministry, until it appear on the one hand, that the nature of the first involves the necessity of such resources, and on the other, that those powers must accordingly be placed in the hands of the latter. Having accomplished this, and at the same time pointed out the adverse rationalistic mode of viewing the subjects commented on, the way is open for greater brevity in what remains to be said.

As before said, the declaration of our Lord, "All power is given unto me, in heaven and in earth," was more than a comforting assurance vouchsafed His Apostles, of the success of their mission. Such assurance He did indeed give them in His subsequent words, "And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." It was a formal proclamation, that all things were ready, all hinderances removed, the great conquest finally achieved, and He now presented Himself before heaven and earth, as the mighty Potentate, the King of kings, and

the Lord of lords, in whom centered all power and dominion, as the Head of the everlasting Kingdom of Heaven. As though He had said, because now such is the case, and I will that my Kingdom shall be established in the whole world, in the midst of the surrounding kingdom of darkness, because of all this—"therefore"—"Go ye and disciple all nations."

It is now pretty generally conceded, that the rendering of the word μαθητευσατε in the original, by *teach* in our English version is incorrect. It catches indeed one of the elements involved in the meaning of that term, but in failing to grasp its deeper idea, it not only misses its true signification, but supplants it with a totally erroneous one. Here is the point where the false conception of the nature and purpose of the incarnation, the consequent unmediated activity of the Holy Spirit, and the still further consequent denial of the supernatural constitution of the Church above referred to, steps forward and seeks to appropriate the interpretation to its own service. While it professes to read "*disciple*" or "*make disciples of*," which is the true rendering of the text, yet it has no power after all to allow any deeper signification to the word, than *mere teaching*. To be a disciple, is to be a learner, a pupil and nothing more. So that the grand means for bringing souls to a saving relation to Christ, is teaching. It is not at all surprising that it should thus construe the word, and most stubbornly maintain the interpretation, for its theology requires just thus much and no more. For if the evil of sin consists in nothing more than a mere obstacle in the way of the soul's normal progress, and requires only that the track be cleared, that it may move forward, in the full enjoyment of all that its constitution was ever designed to comprehend; if the incarnation was only a wisely devised expedient for the removal of its disability, and beyond that of no special service in any way; if it requires now only, that the soul be informed of this gracious provision for its help, while the Holy Spirit stands by, ready to influence to its acceptance, that it may be accounted holy, and made to take its place accordingly, in the company of others thus saved, and being thus a sharer in full in all the

provisions of grace, it is prepared to receive the formal recognition of this heavenly Society, in the shape of Baptism; and if it only yet remains for it, that it shall give diligent heed to such further instruction, as will enable it to order its footsteps aright, and by the help of the Spirit's influence, thus work out its own salvation; if these be all the necessities in the case, then of course "discipling" can have no deeper meaning than teaching. Its wants require nothing more. And to concede any thing more, would furnish it with a superabundance of material, which it could not work into its theological edifice, without a laborious chipping down and great waste. It is perfectly consistent, therefore, for it to make a *disciple* to be nothing more than a *pupil.*

But "to disciple" does mean more than to make a pupil. The word itself, in its deeper signification, involves more. It is not every pupil that becomes the disciple of his teacher. Can we say that every one who studies the philosophical system of Aristotle, becomes his disciple? That all the students of Kant and Hegel, become thereby their respective disciples? But what if they reject their teachings? What if they refuse to subscribe to their speculations, and should go so far as to oppose them? Would they nevertheless be their disciples? No verily. To make a disciple is not only to teach, but also to win as an *adherent.* It is to secure subscription to the doctrine taught, to make a follower of; in a word, it is to lead the learner to a full surrender of his whole person to the interest advanced. This is what is meant by making a disciple, and this is the precise duty with which Christ charged His Apostles when He sent them forth into the rebellious world.

But still, if Christianity is doctrine simply, and not *fact;* if it is dogma, and not life, even this deeper signification of discipleship, calls for nothing more than to teach. All that the case would then require would be, an urgent presentation of the truth, which the attendant influence of the Holy Spirit would so impress upon the mind and will, as to secure a subscription, and win the learner over to its service. In this view also, teaching would be the sole means for discipling. And Baptism

would be nothing more than a subsequent recognition and approval of what was already at hand.

But the question here arises, Is Christianity no more than doctrine? We hardly think that the advocates of the theology just spoken of, would feel prepared to affirm this. Their Christian consciousness would rise up in protest against such an affirmation. And yet it is not easy to see how their system can find room for any thing more. It meets all the necessities in the case for them, and seems fully competent to begin with the impenitent soul, and conduct it safely to heaven. And this is all for which any system of theology need concern itself to provide. No, the heart for them is better than the head. There is more in their faith than in their understanding; more in their consciousness than in their theology. And hence their inability to abide by their logic.

Now, against all this we affirm, that Christianity is *life* (ζωή). A literal theanthropic life, and that, as we have already seen, it is necessary in the case of each individual, that he come to participate really and literally in this life, as it holds in the person of Jesus Christ. No possible activity of the simply human powers, be they never so much aided and stimulated by even Divine influence, can meet the want in the case. And the drawing out and development of these natural powers, being all that teaching can do, we must find vastly more in *μαθητεύσατε*, or content ourselves on Pelagian grounds. For this heresy precisely, after all, underlies this whole order of theological thought.

But as has already appeared, the Church is a veritable, supernatural *kingdom* here on earth. It is a constitution, not simply of power and dominion, but of life. God is not merely a Sovereign, but what is far more, He is a Father. Its office then is to dispense life; and law, and order, only as these interests are comprehended in it. And to this end, must its powers and functions to communicate with the world, be commensurate. These powers must accordingly gather themselves up in the ordinances which our Saviour ordained as the channels through which he stands ever ready to dispense His life, and in turn accept the recipient into communion with His kingdom of grace.

The communication of life, in the positive sense of the term, then, being the object of their institution, they must involve the power to quicken, to infuse life into the recipient; hence the necessity of their comprehending the presence and activity of the Holy Ghost, who only is the Lord and Giver of Life. Moreover, the object upon which these spiritual potencies are appointed to act, is man, as he now stands in the world, and hence there must be for him a visible administrator. A man like unto himself, an *officer* in this spiritual kingdom—a bearer of the Apostolic Commission.

This office, it will at once be seen, is unique; sustaining relations to the kingdom of grace, which ground themselves in this kingdom, and not in the order of nature. It is an investiture by Christ Himself, and involves all the functions through which the Spirit communicates His quickening and sanctifying grace. Its bearer, therefore, stands in the midst of men, as an ambassador and administrator from the Lord of life, and is clothed with a commission to negotiate and receive their submission to, and consummate their participation in the grace of the spiritual kingdom he represents. His functions, therefore, are more than moral, reaching only man's natural powers; they are spiritual and vital, in virtue of their relation to the Holy Ghost.

With such powers did our Saviour clothe His Apostles, as He sent them forth to disciple all nations. This, disciple all nations, was the whole burden of their commission. This was the thing they were charged to do. Not that this was the first step they were to take, to be followed up by others, such as baptizing and subsequent teaching, as so many different stages of progress in the attainment of an end which lay beyond them all. To disciple all nations, was to bring them to the realization of all that was provided for them in the heavenly kingdom, in whose service they were about to act. This interpretation, the grammatical construction of the passage demands: "Go ye, therefore, and teach (disciple) all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have com-

manded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (St. Matth. xxviii. 19–20). Did the passage read, disciple all nations, *and* baptize them, *and* teach them, were the baptising and teaching, imperatives instead of participles, and all three connected by the copulative conjunction *and*, then the grammar would necessitate the interpretation just referred to. But such is not the case. The imperative "make disciples," tell them what they are to do, and the following participles, baptizing and teaching, tells them how to do it.*

The Apostles go forth upon their mission, proclaiming the Gospel of the kingdom. This proclamation was necessary first of all, that the nations might be apprised of its existence, as challenging their submission. Besides this, there is involved in their commission, as the idea of discipling presupposes, the presentation of the claims to which submission is demanded. They must confront man's consciousness of want and ruin, with the provision for deliverance, and thus *open* the way, for his consideration of its claims, and his ultimate submission to its terms. This preaching is the means by which the quickening energy of the Spirit, opens the blinded eye of faith, to an apprehension of the sinner's estate as dead, and the spiritual discernment of the kingdom of life, as the power of deliverance from this ruin. Now, this faith is the organ of the human spirit, by which the objective supernatural order is discerned, and its participation in it made possible. But this subjective power of discernment and receptivity, is by no means one with an actual entrance into it, and a participation in its life. It is only the qualification and ability to do so. The sick man may have a clear appreciation of his condition as under the power of disease, and may be brought to a state of full confidence in the ability and will of his proposed physician, to heal him. But this is something very different from the actual cure itself, or even the reception of the first ministration, in the direction of his cure.

---

* "It," the imperative, "signifies the end, the participles the means. The nations are to be made *disciples of Christ*, or converted to him by two means chiefly, viz., by *baptism*, and by religious *instruction*."—SCHAFF.

All this is but the necessary precursor, in the way of subjective preparation. He may, even at this point, refuse to surrender himself into the hands of his physician, and die. But having reached this state of inward preparation, he is now ready to make the necessary surrendry, and thus come in contact with the remedial agency. Even having reached this point, the needs in his case are not yet fully met. There must be a response to these outgoings on his part, by a corresponding activity on the part of the *curer*, and the power of the cure made over to his person. Faith is the power by which the sinner discerns in Christ his spiritual Physician, and the ability to surrender himself confidingly into His hands. But unless this human activity is met by a curative response on the part of Christ, the soul still remains under the power of death. The office of the Apostle's preparatory preaching is then simply to effect the preparation on the part of the sinful subject, for the reception of the communication of grace. This meeting of the human and divine activities we have in the Sacrament of Baptism, which is the first positive step in the process of discipling.

The objection which is not unfrequently alleged against this view, viz: that the *preached Gospel* is the means by which the Spirit of life is communicated to the soul, involves one of three things. Either, that the Holy Spirit has power to act in an *extraordinary* way, dispensing with the ordinary organs of communication appointed by Christ, and by entering *immediately* into the soul, bring it into union with the life of Christ, in a miraculous way; which no one need concern himself to deny. Or, that the Spirit Himself, directly imparts life by His union with the human subject, which involves the impossible idea of an incarnation in the individual Christian. Or, that faith as a subjective state, is, after all, the only reconstruction of being needed in the case; that because of this reconstruction man is accounted holy, and needs not that the divine shall from without, come into vital contact with him, and impart to him the positive element of a theanthropic life. This, we say again, is Pelagianism, and is the same thing as to say that an alien to our government needs only to come to a clear apprehension of its spirit

and genius; to discern its existence and constitution as an actual fact, and by the exercise of his subjective will surrender himself to its control, and that *ipse facto* he becomes a citizen. Whereas we know that no amount of personal conviction or internal resolve, can be effectual in the case, unless met by the State itself, and through these channels of receptivity, impart to him its franchises and life, while at the same time it incorporates him as a living citizen in its own organism. No alien, be his subjective state never so deeply in accord with the genius of our institutions, can ever become a citizen, unless, indeed, by extraordinary and special legislation, until, by the *political sacrament* of the Oath of Allegiance, the proposed union is consummated. We have in this ordinance of the State, and its mode of exercise, a wonderfully instructive similitude of the spiritual. Both involve the idea of discipling. In each, is this mediated by the governmental commission, in the absence of which this is utterly impossible, unless by the direct activity of the Sovereign Power; and while it must be admitted that this Power may thus act, yet does it do so only in exceptional cases, and may not at any time be safely relied upon, at the expense of neglect and refusal to employ the constitutional means.

We come now to consider the second branch of duty involved in the Apostolic Commission; namely, *teaching*. And in doing so, we may, perhaps, better subserve the purposes of perspicuity and brevity, by following out more or less closely, the analogy just referred to between the State and the Church.

There is a difference between the *teaching* (διδάσκοντες), which is the second element in discipling, and the teaching above referred to, as the precursor of baptism. The latter comprehends, more particularly, the articles of our Christian faith, the confession of which must, in the case of the adult (whose case is alone considered in this article), precede baptism, which ground is covered by catechisation; the former involves the subsequent fuller exposition of the contents of this faith, together with the promulgation of the rules of life and conduct as taught in the Word of God.

This subsequent teaching, is necessary to the full process of

discipling. The newly baptized subject is not supposed to have a full apprehension of all his spiritual relations and duties. He is only a babe in Christ. Living, indeed, and possessing in germ all the necessary powers of apprehension and obedience. But these remain to be developed, and called into active exercise. The same necessity we find in the civil order of the State. The naturalized alien does not at once throw off all the peculiarities and features of his old nationality, immediately upon his investiture with the rights of citizenship. His new relations are to him strange, and more or less indistinctly comprehended. He is yet a comparative stranger to the spirit and genius of the government, in which he has come to share a part, is ignorant of its customs and laws, and consequently, of his rights and duties. In all these points does he require instruction and direction. Nor is he able to attain them by his own individual efforts. So far as the enjoyment of his rights is concerned, the constant mediation of the officers of the government is absolutely indispensable. The execution of the laws in his behalf, in the smallest particular, calls for the presence and activity of the official commission. He may in no case undertake to be the executor of the law in his own behalf, and stand guiltless. This we all understand, and flee to the magistrate for the assertion and protection of our rights. His knowlege of duty also, can be attained only through the same official channel. Is it for him, even though he may have acquainted himself with the teachings of common law, in which our constitution is grounded, and have carefully perused all the round of statute law, is it for him to be the interpreter of all these for himself, and propound authoritatively, what is, and what is not the true line of duty for him to pursue? No, verily. While it is his duty to study diligently the constitution and the laws, it is for the magistrate, the judge, to decide upon the meaning of the statutes, and the precise duties they impose. And to this decision he is bound to submit, or impair his rights of citizenship. He has no means of access to the life of the government, only through the office of the magistrate. The enjoyment of his privileges presupposes this, from the highest to the lowest. What would we think of the citizen,

who would undertake to discard this official mediation, and, for instance, hold a private election for some officer, and solemnly transmit the result to the Sovereign Ruler? Would such an act involve a communion with the life of the nation, of which this Sovereign Ruler is the head? Would it be the enjoyment of a lawful privilege? Would the act have any governmental character or significance at all, only as it would give evidence of a spirit of insubordination?

Analogous to this do we find the spiritual order in the Church. The citizen, newly born into the commonwealth of Israel, is not at once delivered from all the ignorance and baleful effects of his previous estate in sin. He grasps not at once, in the way of knowledge, the whole contents of the supernatural order into which he has entered. He by no means may yet, with an unbeclouded eye, read all the mind of the Spirit, as drawn out in the statute book of inspiration. The powers of spiritual discernment he indeed has; but these are yet infantile, and only by the aid of the Teacher may these be developed. The constitution of the kingdom, the Creed, has been propounded to him, and he has avouched it to be his faith. But there are in it depths of wisdom which he has yet to fathom, which defy his unaided powers. Besides this, he is unable to apprehend the vital import of the laws of the kingdom, as the rule of his life and conduct. He is not able, neither was it ever designed that he should *be*, to be their authoritative interpreter, either for himself or for others. This prerogative pertains to the government itself, and is exercised only by those officers and tribunals divinely instituted for this very end. Scripture can be understood, in any case, only as the Spirit of truth guides to its apprehension (St. John xvi. 13—15); and His guidance is promised to those appointed to teach, and not in the same manner to the reader and learner of the Word. He is present, in a special manner, to the bearer of the divine Commission, to qualify him for his work; while to the learner, the preached Gospel, and not the written, is the appointed means for his instruction. No private Christian, therefore, may, without incurring the judgment of insubordination, undertake to interpret the Bible autho-

ritatively, either for himself or for others. This Book is, indeed, the rule of faith and life; not as he in his weakness may understand it, but as it is interpreted and explained to him through the ordinance in which the Spirit is efficient for this purpose. It is preposterous, therefore, to imagine, that all that is needful in the case of any Christian, is that he may have an open Bible, and that regardless of his spiritual and intellectual qualifications, he is nevertheless able to read its profound meaning, and authorized to order accordingly, his life and conduct. The advancement of such a doctrine as respects our political relations, would be held on all hands to be conclusive evidence of either mental imbecility or raving fanaticism; and it is surprising that it should enjoy any more favorable judgment, when it is held as valid for the Church. Even the bearer of the Apostolic Commission, may not esteem his individual judgment as final and authoritative, only as it may be found to be in accord with the pronouncement of the highest tribunal, the Supreme Court, as we may term it, in which is lodged the full powers of sovereignty for this end. As now the minister propounds the meaning of Scripture, as thus authoritatively pronounced, he speaks in the name, and by the authority of his divine Master. "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me." (St. Luke x. 16.)

Through the channel of the Apostolic Commission, then, is the Christian to learn the contents of the organic constitution of the Kingdom of Heaven—the Creed, and be instructed, as to his duties and privileges, and enjoy the means and ordinances through which his union with his Lord is to be maintained and furthered. The rule of duty, however, is no sooner proclaimed, than it awakes a consciousness of inability to live in full conformity to its spiritual requirements. Here comes into view the sad fact of post-baptismal sins. These, of course, involve a sense of guilt, and to the same extent misery. They disturb the harmony of relations between the soul and its Redeemer, and if not overcome and removed in the way of forgiveness, must in the end prove fatal. But this necessity is amply pro-

vided for in the Divine Statute, where certain conditions are specified, upon compliance with which this guilt is effectually removed. But now the execution of this gracious provision, presupposes an executor. And as the Sovereign Power communicates not immediately, but mediately through the ordinances and offices of the government, there must be an official function at hand to make the provision operative. The conditions propounded in the case are repentance and amendment, which being complied with by the transgressor, require the acceptance of the forgiving power, when the disability is removed and peaceful relations are restored. This requires the office of the minister, who, taking knowledge of the compliance with the terms, declares the divine requirements satisfied. It is in his official, not his individual capacity, that he acts in the case, and pronounces absolution. Here comes into view the meaning of the Saviour's words to His Apostles, after that he had breathed upon them and said, "Receive, ye, the Holy Ghost:" "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained," (St. John xx. 22–23).

We have not yet, however, reached the the full idea of discipleship. Something more is necessary, whether in the civil or spiritual order, than to enter into communion with its life, and to escape its penal sanctions. In either case the old habit of life still exists, and requires to be overcome by a continuous participation in the life and spirit of the new order into which it has entered. His is but an outward, nominal citizenship, who withdrawing himself from the more immediate circle of governmental powers and activities, takes no part in them, and refusing to surrender himself up to be permeated by their life and spirit, clings to his old nationality, as it holds in his person. On the other hand, it needs that he be in constant active contact with them, that he participate in them, and that he take part in those ordinances, by which the fact of his approved citizenship is from time to time sealed to him, and he in turn is made to drink still deeper into the consciousness of his union with them. Thus only is it possible that the force of his alien

life will be overcome, and he ultimately transformed into the image of the new.

We may single out one ordinance in the State, in illustration of this point. The Ballot Box is, perhaps, in our nation, the point at which, above all others, the individual citizen comes into living, conscious contact with the government. All his other activities as a citizen, are indeed within the pale, and overshadowing protection of the government, but they bring him not into such a real participation in its organic life. This places him in actual communion, not with one of its departments, but with its centre of sovereignty. It may be said in some sense, to be his second political sacrament, just as the Oath of Allegiance was his first. His title to participate in it holds in the fact that as a citizen he is *rectus in curiâ*. From any disability which he may have contracted, he must first be purged by the judgment of the proper officer, and having been thus purged, he is entitled to this highest and most distinct assurance and seal of his full citizenship, and freedom from all political disability. His title to this dignity is thereby proclaimed and confirmed, and any doubts which he may have entertained upon the subject, are thereby dissipated. And all this, too, not simply by the officer who may preside over this ordinance. It is the ordinance itself, as the utterance of the Sovereign Power of the State, just as though the Chief Executive in his own proper person, should declare to the voter and to all the world besides, "This man is a true and accepted citizen, free from all civil disability." Besides this, the voter is in receipt of actual political grace at the same time. He is awakened up to a still fuller sense of his real participation in the government, feels that his political life in him has been strengthened and established, transforming him more and more into the image of the new, and eradicating the features of his old nationality. Moreover, the presence of this life of the state in the election, is in no way dependent upon the subjective state of the voter. He may believe the fact or he may deny it, that does not in the least affect the reality. There it is, independent of his judgment altogether. This holds not in any separate feature or part of the transac-

tion. It holds not alone in the fact of the presence of the proper officer, neither in the ballot, neither in the outward machinery, but in all these combined. It holds in the general fact of the *election*, comprehending all these outward accidents, each one of which, however, is essential to the whole.

So, too, the disciple of Christ is that man, who, having attained to a participation in His life, by incorporation into His body, the Church, will, in the end, be transformed into His perfect image, soul and body, only as he keeps himself in communion with this living fountain, in the use of the appointed means. No amount of spiritual exercise will compensate for the want of spiritual food. A man may be never so careful to exercise his bodily and mental powers, as necessary to the development of corresponding health and strength, yet all in the end will depend upon his proper supplies of daily bread. The Christian may be equally active in all the round of good works, and the cultivation of all the graces, but still holds good that solemn truth, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you" (St. John vi. 53). All these are activities on the human side, going out indeed towards God, but in themselves, involving no corresponding activity on the part of God going out towards man. This mutual approach we find reserved for that grand central fact of all worship, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

In this Sacrament we have presented to our *faith*, the life of our Lord Jesus Christ, divine-human, as it holds historically in the Church which is His Mystical Body. This is in Scripture denominated His Body and Blood. By it we are brought into actual communion with Him. And while on the one hand, we having been purged of our sins, by repentance and reformation, through the absolution of the ministry, it confirms the fact of our vital and saving relation to Him, testifying publicly our freedom from the penalty of sin, and our continued acceptance by Him; it, on the other hand, imparts to us the power of this same theanthropic life as the "medicine of immortality," the purifier of our Adamic nature, and the principle of our progressive and final sanctification. All this now, of course, by the

immediate presence and energy of the Holy Spirit. This presence of Christ in the Eucharist, is in both His divine and human natures, the fulness of the Godhead, and the fulness of humanity, body, soul and spirit. Yet this not carnally, but in the power of His life, spiritually as mediated by the Holy Ghost. To this most solemn and awful presentation on the part of God, does the Christian approach, and by the power of faith does he discern the heavenly contents. And by the same receptivity does he apprehend and partake.

Now it must be very clear, that the subjective state of the recipient, has nothing to do with the determination of the divine presence, as the contents of the Sacrament. This is an existing fact in the constitution of the ordinance itself; and is mediated, so far as the bread and wine are concerned, by the minister, as the bearer of the Apostolic Commission. He, by virtue of his office, consecrates the elements, thereby setting them apart to a sacramental use. In the absence of the power of this commission, there can be no sacrament, just as there can be no election, without the presence of the properly authorized officer of the State. It is equally clear that we cannot predicate this presence of the bread and wine alone, any more than we can say that the life of the State is in the ticket which the citizen votes. It holds in the whole sacramental transaction. The minister stands here on this fearfully holy ground as the organ of the Holy Ghost, by which these heavenly mysteries are presented to the people; and this, in connection with the exercise of his teaching functions, fills out the measure of the Apostolic Commission to disciple the children of men.

It needs only to add, in the way of conclusion, a few words on the subject of Christian Discipline. This, too, is a power comprehended in the general terms of the Commission. It enters not, however, as an element, into the positive, aggressive process of discipling all nations, but rather as a defensive power. All living constitutions, whatever be their ultimate aim, must comprehend these two faculties: the first, and main one, the power to take up its proper material, and assimilate it to its own kind; the other, to reject what may not be assimilated,

whether in the way of refusal to apprehend, or to cast out what offends and is contrary to its spirit, even after an apprehension. The very ability to preserve its distinctive character, and accomplish its mission, requires these powers. The existence of sin makes these necessary, both in the State and in the Church. All aliens, who refuse to accede to the terms of citizenship, are by the very proclamation of the terms itself, excluded and consigned to all the pains of non-citizenship. While all citizens, failing to obey the laws, and violating the harmony of the civil organism, must be cast out either in the way of exile, perpetual confinement, or execution. In either case, removing them from its pale, and consigning them to the penalty of exclusion from its benefits and blessings. But in no case is it possible for these powers to come into play, except through the agency, and in the person of the properly commissioned officer.

Similarly, also, in the Church. The very proclamation of the terms of salvation, most effectually shuts the door against all who will not accept. Hence is the ministry, "unto God, a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish; to the one we are a savor of death unto death; and to the other a savor of life unto life." And well did the Apostle add, "And who is sufficient for these things?" (2 Cor. ii. 15, 16.) It is, indeed, the very power of God Himself, binding and loosing the souls of men as to their eternal estate. So, too, in the case of members in the Church, who, led astray by the power of the evil one, set at naught its life and laws, and make common cause with its enemies. After all proper effort has failed to win them back to their allegiance, to lead them to repentance and submission to the Lord Jesus Christ, the minister is authorized and empowered to formally cut such off from the kingdom of life, exclude them from the ordinances of grace, and give them over to the power of the Devil. In this, as in the other case, the official act of the minister carries with it the force of a divine decree. It is God Himself acting through His officer; and the sentence is binding for this world, as well as for the world to come. No wonder that the minister starts back from the awful duty of excommunicating a soul, as it is nothing less than to

consign it to hell, unless the grace of God may yet prevail to soften a doubly hardened heart, and lead it back to repentance and faith. As the judge of the court pronounces the sentence of death upon the guilty culprit, only when commanded by the solemn obligations of his office, so the minister gives the erring soul over to perdition, only as his divine Commission constrains him to utter the judgment of Almighty God.

ART. II.—THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST.

BY PROF. T. G. APPLE, A.M., OF MERCERSBURG COLLEGE, PA.

When man was first created and placed in the garden of Eden, he was perfect and complete, so far as it was possible for him to be perfect and complete, by an act of creation. A great and important work still remained to be done before he could reach his true destiny. This much is already intimated by the trial on which he was put in regard to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and also by the presence of the mysterious tree of life, mention of which is first made after man fell. We infer from these things, 1st, That it was necessary for man to act freely and willingly in accordance with the laws of his being, before he could attain perfection, and 2ndly, That in doing this, he would be met by some provision on the part of God, by which he might attain the destiny for which he was created.

These inferences are confirmed by the light that is thrown upon the subject of man's destiny in the salvation provided in Christ. The work of Christ in saving man more than repairs the damage of the fall. Man is elevated to a condition far above that of his creation. Was this an after-thought of God? or was it only possible thus to elevate man after he had sinned? Neither of these positions are tenable. Rather, we would suppose, it was God's *original* design to link man's nature in everlasting and blissful union with Himself through the Son.

We are thus led to the conclusion that humanity, as originally created, was designed to reach its full perfection in Jesus Christ, who is represented in the New Testament as the absolute Head of the race, and that the effect of sin, instead of changing the original purpose of God in regard to man, only served to modify the form in which this purpose was now to be carried out. Without sin, there would have been no suffering, and while, therefore, there would still have been a mediator between God and man, yet there would have been no *suffering* Saviour.

Adam was the head of the human race, as he was also the crowning glory of creation. Christ is the *absolute* Head of the race, in whom alone the whole creation finds its *highest* meaning and perfection. Man's personality in his creation was relative; it becomes absolute in Jesus Christ, in whom humanity is joined in personal union with God. If we ask now, why man was not created in this perfect state, in union with God, our reply is, that this consummation could only be reached by a process after his creation. It could be attained only in the sphere of freedom, in the exercise of reason and will. Hence the union of the Son of God with the race, follows as a fact of history after the creation.

In the history of our fallen race, this union took place in the holy conception and birth of our blessed Saviour more than eighteen hundred years ago. In that conception and birth, the Son of God took human nature into everlasting union with Himself, so that in Christ, the divine and human natures are united in one person.

As to this, the teaching of Scripture and the symbols of the Church are clear. Christ is divine, being God over all, blessed forevermore. He is also human, possessing all the powers, properties and attributes of human nature. And yet there are not two Christs, but one Christ.

The teaching of the early Church, which has come to be regarded as substantially authoritative and final in all subsequent ages, in regard to the humanity of Christ, is contained in the decision of the Council of Chalcedon, A. D., 451. It is as fol-

lows:—"Following, therefore, the holy fathers, we all teach and confess with one voice (*συμφώνως*), one Son, one Lord Jesus Christ, to be perfect as respects Godhood, and perfect as respects manhood; that He is truly God, and truly man of a rational soul and body; that He is consubstantial with the Father as to His Godhead, and consubstantial with us as to His humanity, and like us in all respects, sin excepted. He was begotten of the Father before creation as to His deity; but in these last days, for us and for our salvation, He was born of the Virgin Mary the mother of God, as to his humanity. He is one Christ, *existing* in two natures, without mixture, without change, without division, without separation, the diversity of the two natures not being at all destroyed in the union, but the peculiar properties of each nature being preserved, and concurring to one person and one substance, &c." (Gieseler, vol. I, p. 240, note 8.) This decision was based upon the noted letter of Leo, Bishop of Rome, *Epistola ad Flavianum*, which was, indeed, made the rule of faith, the Council only adding new illustrations and explanations. (Gieseler, ibid.)

The controversy on the subject was, indeed, opened subsequently in the rise of the *Monophysite* heresy, and still later, by an attempt to reconcile the Monophysites in the Monothelite heresy; but this last was finally condemned in the 6th Œcumenical Council, A.D., 680, and the matter finally put to rest.

Having this clear and full decision before us, our object now is only to inquire what we are to understand by the human nature of Christ, or his manhood, or humanity, as it is variously termed.

In the inspired words of St. John, we are told that "The Word became flesh," not that the Word became a man. By human nature, or humanity, in the Chalcedon Creed, we understand the same thing as the flesh, *σαρ*, of St. John. Olshausen comments on this as follows: "Just as little, moreover, could the Evangelist have said: *εγενετο ανθροπος*, *became a man*, which would represent the Redeemer as one man among many, while *He*, as second Adam, represented collective human nature

in a sublime, comprehensive personality." The error against which we are to guard here is, that the Logos joined Himself to an individual man, the son of Mary. The danger of falling into this error arises, no doubt, from the fact, that it is difficult for us to conceive of human nature, as a reality, except as it exists in a human person. If we consider its parts, the body and soul, or the soul, body and spirit, wherever these are united ordinarily, we have a man. It was, no doubt, an honest effort to maintain this conception of the real humanity of Christ, that led Nestorius to the conclusion that, as there are two natures in Christ, there must be also two persons or hypostases.

The humanity of Christ is impersonal, or anhypostatic, in itself considered. There is no human *ego* in Christ, as the centre of His human nature, that is as holding alongside the divine *ego*, for this would be Nestorianism in its most crass form.

The question now arises, how can there be a human nature, or a humanity, apart from its concrete existence in a human person. Did Christ assume human nature, or humanity, as a generality? There is a law of life or being which we hold to be not a mere abstraction, or conception of the mind, but a real entity, a power, from which all human existences, in individual form, proceed. This generality, while it is real, is, according to its very definition, impersonal. Was this the humanity which the Logos assumed?

So far as we are able to understand him, this is the view of Dr. Ebrard. "If we would correctly apprehend," he says (Herzog's Encyclopedia, pt. 12, p. 731, Bomberger's trans.), "the ancient Church doctrine of the two natures, we must take φύσις in the abstract sense in which it was used. . . . His" (Christ's), "human nature is the man's nature, or mode of being and constitution, which *for itself does not subsist*, but which, as a *universal attribute*, exists in all other men, and since His incarnation, also in Him—the *natura hominum*."

He makes use of the words, human form, human constitution, as expressing that which is designated by the term φύσις—nature. The passage of Scripture in Phil. ii. 6, "Who being in the form of God (εν μορφη θεοῦ), thought it not robbery to

be equal with God; but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form, *μορφην*, of a servant, and was made in the likeness *ομοιωματι* of men; and being found in fashion, *σχήματι*, as a man, &c., &c," is referred to as teaching this view. According to it, God the Son, by an act of self-privation, places Himself within the limits of time and space, of human existence, and assumes the constitution of human existence.

But what is this general law of human life, this generality, apart from individual existence? In such a separate view, it is an abstraction. Ebrard explains further his meaning, when he says, "To have human feeling, will and thought, and as a human soul to animate a human body, is human nature." This language we are prepared to adopt. To say that the Logos assumed human nature as a generality, is doubtless true, otherwise we are in danger of running into Nestorianism; only we must guard equally against the error of Eutichianism on the other side. This we do, when we hold that the Logos united with Himself really human nature of the flesh and blood of the Virgin Mary. It was a human soul-germ, which stood livingly in the race, *through which* He linked with Himself the mode or law of human life, which we call humanity as a generality. We may say, therefore, that He had a human soul, and a human body of the substance of the Virgin Mary. There is no absurdity, we think, in supposing that the Saviour resembled His mother, according to the ordinary law of human life, that He was affected by her peculiar personal traits, so far as these hold in the relation between parent and child, though, at the same time, whatever of imperfection (we mean now sinless imperfection) may have attached to these, was overruled and made to disappear by His perfect fulness of life. While, therefore, Christ realized in Himself the perfect ideal of humanity, as a universal man, and therefore was free from all individual one-sideness, or faulty idiosyncracy, so that no one temperament predominated, but all were fully and perfectly balanced; yet His humanity started, not from an abstract general law, but a concrete soul-germ. Not only was the law of this human

life truly human, but the material which this law acted upon was really and truly human, of the flesh and blood of the Virgin Mary. In any other sense, we could not accept Dr. Ebrard's view, that the Logos assumed humanity as a generality. The humanity which He assumed, was not merely human, but it was of a peculiar type. Christ was, for instance, a Jew, yet this national type in Him was subordinate and subservient to the universal type which He realized in His life.

Beyond thus defining it against error, we, of course, cannot fathom the mystery of the incarnation. How such human nature, as body, soul, and spirit, including a human will, could be held in personal union with the divine, so that His humanity was complete without a human personality, or *ego*, we cannot understand, but we believe it as a mystery revealed for faith.

To the humanity of Christ, then, belong all the parts, elements and properties which belong to us men, the accident of sin excepted.

In its commencement it was human nature, the same as that of His virgin mother, and therefore fallen. From the moment of the holy conception, sin was eliminated; and this was possible, because sin is not an essential part of human nature. But it fell heir to the full effects or consequences of sin, as well as to the weaknesses and imperfections of our nature which accrue to us—not only as sinners, but as having failed, in Adam, to attain our true glorified state. Christ grew, increased in wisdom and in favor with God and man. As the person of Christ was one and theanthropic, we can predicate of Christ everything that may be predicated of His human nature. Just as in the union of body and soul in man (an illustration used by Dr. Shedd, in his History of Christian Doctrine), if the body is injured, the person is injured; if the mind is tranquil, the person is serene. Christ hungered and thirsted, became weary, and sought repose.

His growth, or development, reached also to His intellectual and moral nature. He increased in knowledge, making use, doubtless, to some extent, of natural and ordinary means, though He enjoyed also extraordinary and supernatural means,

in His intimate fellowship with God. In the development of His human intelligence, there were doubtless unseen miracles, as these appeared in his outward life. But as the Saviour's recorded miracles were not merely divine works, but truly human works, and wonderful, because they were an exhibition of human faith and power when thus lifted up in union with God, so this intellectual progress, though unusual, and even miraculous, was truly human. Thus we can say of Him, that He came to a consciousness of God His Father, came to know Him, as His words, at His twelfth year, in the temple, intimate, "Wist ye not, that I must be about my Father's business?"

Where there is bodily growth and intellectual development, there must also be a moral or spiritual development. This also is intimated in the words, "He increased in favor with God." Also, in those words of the Apostle, "Though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered; and being made perfect, He became the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him."

We found in the commencement of this article, that human nature in its creation, while it was good, free from all sin, and inclined to all good, was yet not perfect, but awaited a process of free development and glorification, in order to become perfect. How much more was such a process of development and glorification, not only possible, but also necessary, in the fallen humanity which the Son of God assumed? By its very constitution, as resting under the burden or consequences of sin, and by reason of its surroundings in a sinful world, exposed to temptation from the world of darkness, it was necessary that Christ should elevate and perfect human nature by a real struggle and victory over sin and death.

We are brought here to the contemplation of the temptation of Christ. The proper understanding of this mysterious portion of His history involves a consideration, not only of His susceptibility of temptation as possessing a human soul, but especially the nature of His human will, inasmuch as His obedience was a free and willing obedience, and His victory over sin thus

a free, and not a compulsory victory. We assert here with *Lange*, that the very idea of temptation implies the possibility of sinning. Without such possibility in any sense, the temptation of Christ would have been the veriest sham. This will appear, if we consider that His triumph over the temptation of the Devil was a personal victory, a step in the process of His own perfecting of Himself, as well as for the benefit of His people. It was for His people, in that it was for Himself first a moral victory. But how could there have been a progress in His moral status, a perfecting of Himself in a real moral victory, where there was no possibility of doing aught else than what He did?

This view is required by the nature of Christ's human will. To be a truly human will, it must have what is essential to every other human will in a process of trial; that is, the power of yielding to evil. If the human in the person of Christ had been compelled by an overshadowing power to will as it did, then all freedom and virtue would have been gone. Indeed, we cannot see then why God could not have so controlled the will of Adam as to keep him from the fall.

There is a precautionary clause added to the decision of the sixth Œcumenical Council, already referred to, held at Constantinople, in the year 680, which was intended to be against any false conclusions derived from their decision by the Monothelites. "Two wills, and two natural modes of working, united without schism, and without confusion, as well as without change; so that no conflict ever existed between them, but the human will was invariably subject to the divine and almighty will."

This was evidently as far as they could go; and considering that their object was to meet the objections of the Monothelites, one of which, doubtless, would be, that if there were two wills in Christ, the one might contradict the other, it is strongly in favor of the position we have presented. It declares, not that there was no possibility of conflict, or that it was impossible for the human to be otherwise than subject to the divine will; but it merely asserts that it *was* invariably subject, and hence there *was* no conflict. To be in subjection with Him was to be willingly

obedient. He went to Nazareth, and was subject to His parents. He rendered a willing obedience. Thus His human will was in subjection to the divine. The divine will was one with the will of the Father, concerning which He declares: "I came not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me."

The temptation of Christ was renewed, or repeated under a different form during His last sufferings. Then it was in the form of terrible fears, as the first addressed itself more to desire. "Who in the days of His flesh, when He had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears, unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard in that He feared." Who that reads the account of the agonies of Gethsemane, when the prayer was offered, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt," but must feel that there was not a compulsory obedience, but a free one? When He humbled Himself, and became obedient, even unto death, it was a free and willing sacrifice, and one that caused the terrible struggle in the garden and on the cross, which must always remain a profound mystery to us.

We are not, of course, required to answer supposed contingencies, as for instance, what would have been the consequence if the human will of Christ had not been subject to the divine? We might as well ask, what would have become of heaven, and the preparation made for the saints, and the promises in regard to them, *if* all men had rejected Christ, as they certainly had the power to do? It is sufficient for us to know that Christ our Lord was freely, willingly obedient in all things, and thus successfully carried our common nature through its necessary trial, with all the difficulties and burdens of the fall, and that He thus gained a glorious victory over sin, and wrought out a positive holiness and salvation for us.

Olshausen, using the proposition that you can predicate of Christ whatever may be predicated of either nature, teaches that both statements are true. It was possible for Christ to sin, and it was not possible for Christ to sin. Subjectively, *i. e.*, referring to his human nature, it was possible; objectively, that is,

referring to his divine nature, it was not possible. As we are considering only the humanity, and not the divinity as such, of Christ, we shall not stop to examine this position. The human nature of Christ was that in which He suffered. As Christ is the eternal Son of God, it follows that He who is God of God, very God of very God, suffered and died. "For it was no other person who suffered under Pontius Pilate, than He who was born of the Virgin Mary; He who was born of the Virgin Mary, was no other person than He who was conceived by the Holy Ghost; He who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, was no other person than our Lord; and that our Lord no other than the only Son of God." (Pearson on the Creed.) Yet Christ suffered, not in His divine nature, but in His human nature. "For, although the properties of each nature may be attributed to the one Person, the properties of the one nature cannot be attributed to the other nature." (Shedd.) "Christ suffered for us in the flesh." (1 Pet. iv. 9.) "He was put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit."

We follow, thus, that human nature which the Son of God assumed in His holy conception and birth, down through our Saviour's life, in His trials and sorrows, in His obedience and victory, to His death upon the cross. While His body lay in the grave, and His soul entered Hades, this same human nature remained personally united with the Son of God. On the third day Christ arose from the dead, and in His resurrection and ascension He entered into His state of exaltation and glory. We come now to consider, briefly, Christ's humanity in its glorified state, and in its relation to the Church, which is the body of Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

We are taught from the Scriptures by the Church, that the glorified humanity of Christ is to remain in everlasting hypostatic union with His divine nature. This is a wonderful truth, which serves to give us a deeper insight into the meaning of Incarnation. Here is a form of being which the Eternal Son of God has joined to His Godhead as an eternal state, that is for an eternity to come. This, we say, serves to open up to our view the wonderful depths of the fact of the Incarnation.

It seems to indicate that the "Word was made flesh," not only for a merely temporary purpose, as, for instance, the subduing of sin, and the suffering for human guilt; for if this were all, then we might suppose that after this particular work was done the human nature would be laid aside, and the God-man return to His original state or form of being as the Eternal Word. The fact of this continuous union of humanity with divinity seems to indicate, that it still performs a function or office for the Church. Nay, more, it leads us at least to ponder the meaning of that *image* of God in which man was created, the eternity of that image, and its relation to its actualization, or revelation in the Incarnate Word. A relation of this kind in one of the persons of the Godhead, which begins in time to continue throughout the eternity *to come*, cannot be absolutely sundered, we would think, from the being of God in the eternity that *is past*. It has led to the inquiry whether man was not created for the Incarnation, as well as whether the Incarnation was not for man. This latter question is, of course, answered in the affirmative, but it has been a matter of earnest thought how far it may be explained also by an affirmative answer to the former. In other words, it has been asserted by some of the ablest theologians of this age, and of other ages, that there is in God an eternal aptitude for man, as we know there is in man's nature an aptitude for God. And this has been earnestly discussed without holding for a moment any error of pantheism.

But we do not desire to enter upon this point, which our subject naturally suggests. We desire further only to inquire into the relation of Christ's humanity, now that it is glorified, to the Church.

It was the humanity of Christ, as we have seen, that furnished the form for His life and work on earth. He came into the world through a human birth, he taught through a human voice, he suffered in human nature. Are we not warranted in saying, that the work which He now continues to perform in the Church, He performs through the same human nature, now glorified, in which He suffered and died? In attempting to

maintain the affirmative of this proposition, we assume the truth of the mystical union. When the New Testament declares that the Church is His body, and that believers are united to Him, we assume that it teaches the substantial, vital, union of Christ and His people. Assuming this, we may inquire still more particularly into the nature of this union. In Christ the divine and human are united immediately and directly, in a hypostatic union. This cannot be the case with man; for in that case he would be deified, and we would thus be involved in pantheism.

The same difficulty, it seems to us, is presented in the view, very commonly held, that the Holy Spirit, as the third person of the Trinity, directly unites Himself with man, and thus unites man with God. If this union is eternal, what have we here again but a pantheistic view of the believer's relation with God. Besides, the teaching of our Saviour in regard to the work of the Spirit seems to imply, that this work stands mysteriously related to the glorified humanity of Christ. "The Spirit was not yet given, because Christ was not yet glorified." "He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall He speak. He shall glorify me: for He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you."

If then man is not united directly to the divine nature, may we not say that he is united to God through Christ's humanity by the operation of the Holy Ghost? In this case we could see how the humanity of Christ now is the form or medium, through which the work of redemption is carried forward, just as that humanity was the form in which redemption was wrought out in His person. God communes with man only through a revelation. The highest and fullest revelation is that in the God-man. Here then it is that the way has been prepared for man to come into communion with God. The humanity of Christ is the link by which the whole creation is brought back, and bound in everlasting harmonious union with the great Creator.

This will serve to explain why our Saviour seems to be so emphatic, in presenting this side of His life, as the true meat and

drink of His people. "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." When we consider, in connection with these sayings the words of Christ in the institution of the Holy Supper, "This is my body," and the great mystery which the Church has always held to be involved in that Sacrament, we are challenged to ask why those terms, which denote the humanity of Christ, are so emphatically employed in this connection. It will not satisfy the case to say, that these terms are employed to turn attention the more emphatically to the sacrifice on the cross, as the ground of our salvation, in which sacrifice, though Christ suffered as a divine-human person, yet He suffered and died in His human nature. For we have seen already, that the continued union of glorified humanity in His person must lead to the inference, that this humanity still continues to perform an office in the work of man's redemption. If the office which it performs lies wholly in the past, we could not see why it was not laid aside when that past work was done. Moreover the terms in which it is referred to imply a present and continuous work, a life-giving, sanctifying work. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, *hath eternal life*, and I will raise him up at the last day." This points to our life, and looks forward to the final triumph of life over death in the resurrection.

We might have a merely moral union with God, as many hold the union with Christ to be, without any mediation. Such a union existed in man's creation. There could be no vital union directly with God without involving pantheism. But the tree of life in the garden, and the Sacrament of the altar in the Church, point to a more intimate and real union to which the first pointed and looked for its completion.

Now, in applying what we have said, to what may be regarded as a representative subject, the Lord's Supper, our view of the humanity of Christ leads us to see the necessity for the presence of the humanity of Christ in that holy Sacrament. It is not present as a mere accompaniment of His divinity which is omnipresent, but it is present as the medium through

which we are made partakers of the divine nature, and as the true spiritual nourishment of regenerated man. We might, and do, say, that the humanity of Christ is present in the Eucharist, because His life is present, and that life, being theanthropic, includes the human as well as the divine. But we mean to assert more than this. For in this assertion we merely establish the truth of the presence of Christ's humanity without necessarily teaching any specific office or work for that humanity; whereas we wish to affirm, that the humanity of Christ is present in the Lord's Supper as that, in and through which He makes us partakers of the divine nature. It is thus only, as we think, that we can hold fast to the great mystery of the words of the institution of the Holy Supper.

Thus we find the deep significance of Christ's humanity in His glorification as well as in His humiliation. In His glorification Christ carries up humanity to its true and proper destiny, as contemplated and designed, shall we not say, in man's original creation. "Christ is the archetypal Man, in whom the true ideal of humanity has been brought into view." We behold Him now in His true character as the absolute Head of the race, in whom the humanity of Adam comes to its full completion. His glorified humanity is now the mirror in which the divine glory is reflected. He has elevated humanity to the crowning glory of the universe of God, while He is Head over all things to the Church, gathering into one, recapitulating, all things in heaven and on earth.

As such new and absolute Head of the race, He now unites to Himself in the mystical union, all who in the new birth of water and the Spirit are made members of His mystical body. As individual men are members of the first Adam by natural generation and birth, and partake of his nature, so by the new birth they are made members of Christ, and partakers of His glorified humanity. They are united to Christ through His life, which is truly a human life. Thus the glorified humanity of Christ becomes the medium of man's union with God in his state of salvation. Christians are united to the Logos, not immediately, as was humanity in the hypostatical union in the person

of Christ, but mediately through His humanity, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, in a mystical union.

The result of this union, when it is finally wrought out, is the glorification of the Church in the resurrection and the life everlasting. Here, at last, man attains his true destiny. He stands at the head of creation, ruler over all things with Christ. Here he attains to his proper consciousness, as related to creation below him, and to God above him. He now realizes that image and likeness of God in which he was created. The mystery of creation is solved in the mystery of redemption, and the dark shadow of sin is forever shut out from the kingdom of God.

ART. III.—THE WORD AND SACRAMENTS.

BY REV. WALTER E. KREBS, A. M., WAYNESBORO, PA.

After our Lord Jesus Christ had wrought out in His divine-human person a complete salvation for the race of man, and had thus laid the foundation of a spiritual kingdom in the world, He ascended up on high, and is now seated at the right hand of the Father Almighty. But before his ascension he made outward provision for the extension of salvation to every member of the human race, by establishing the necessary means, and selecting the men to carry them out. What was now needed was the out-pouring of the Holy Ghost, that the men thus selected might be endued with the necessary grace, and the means established be made effective to the end designed. This end is none other than the perfection of individuals in their new Head, the second Adam, in whom shall all be made alive.

The chief means established by Christ for this purpose are the Word and the Sacraments. Being appointed by Christ Himself, it is natural to suppose that they are adapted to all times, places, and circumstances, without change in their character or mutual relations, and with no necessity for the introduction of

new ones. In considering these means of grace, our object in this article will be to discover the specific difference in their operation and design, and to point out the relation that subsists between them.

Before entering upon this task, however, it may not be superfluous to define the means of grace which we have proposed to discuss. Of mistaking the Sacraments there is no danger, for by them we mean Holy Baptism, and the Holy Eucharist. But the expression "Word of God" is used in three or four different senses. Sometimes it denotes the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, sometimes an energy or power proceeding from God. Again it is used to signify the Holy Scriptures, and then the preaching of the Gospel. It is in the last sense that we make use of the expression "Word of God," in the present article. It is to be remembered, however, that this sense is closely connected with the one immediately preceding, as, indeed there is a common ground to them all. The preaching of the Gospel is based continually on the Holy Scriptures, not simply because texts are almost universally taken therefrom, but because the the truth of God contained in the written Word becomes, by the power of the same Spirit who first inspired it, incarnated in the living ministry. It is by the truth, as thus taken up and proclaimed by flesh and blood, that God designs to spread throughout the world and to the end of time the knowledge of His name. It is, therefore, not by multiplying copies of the printed Bible *ad infinitum*, and scattering them over the world like the leaves of Autumn, that God will regenerate and save humanity, but by the labors of living men, whom he calls, qualifies, and authorizes to administer His Word and Sacraments, as every one must acknowledge, who weighs well every word of the Apostolic Commission, "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world."

In order to discover what part the Word in distinction from the Sacraments, and the Sacraments from the Word, are de-

signed to accomplish as means in carrying forward this great work, we must first have a clear idea of the work itself which is to be accomplished. That work, as we have previously said, in general, is to save the individual members of the race, lost and ruined by the fall. *Individual* members we say; for the nature common to them all is already sanctified and brought to its destined degree of glory in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the race itself as a whole is potentially saved in Him. Thus in Him, the Second Adam, the race really starts anew; and the Head being now perfected, it remains only that individuals, dead in trespasses and sins, be grafted into Him, and then grow up in His life. What is thus needed on the part of individuals is as real a union or connection with Christ, as they have by nature with Adam. What this union or connection is in either case no one will pretend to be able to explain. It is not a moral or mental union simply, or a union in the way of sympathy. Men may feel as Adam felt, think as he thought, will as he willed, but who will presume to assert that there is not something that lies at the basis of all these human acts from which they proceed? *That something* we denominate *life*, human life, which every individual possesses and which makes him what he is, and binds him to the head and to all the other members. We may therefore characterize the union of individuals with their head as a *life-union*. But even under this name, we do not know it; for it is a thing of mystery. Life is a mystery wherever it is found. Its effects or manifestations are everywhere visible, but in itself it is beyond the reach of every one of the senses.

Will any one undertake to deny that the union between Adam and his posterity is anything less than a life-union? Will any one deny that it is only in virtue of such a union, that the whole race is in the same sinful and mortal state, into which its original head by transgression fell? So also by parity of reason, it cannot be denied as Christ is the Second Adam, that is, the new head of the race, who did not pervert his life by transgression, but perfected it by his obedience, death, and resurrection, that a life-union, similar to but deeper and higher than the na-

tural one with the first Adam, must be formed between him and all those of the old race who wish to become members of the new, and thus be brought from the Adamic state of sin and death, to the Christian state of holiness and life. "As *in Adam* all die, even so *in Christ* shall all be made alive." "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." The popular interpretation of being in Christ is, believing in Him, loving Him, having a blissful feeling of being at peace with Him. But while all this may be the case, yet it is just this that is not the complete meaning of this momentous expression. As well might we say that to be in Adam signifies to believe in him, to love him, to sympathize with him. As well might we say that the branches are in the trunk of the tree, and mean *only* that they look or are affected like the trunk. And does not Christ say, "I am the vine, ye are the branches?" As well might we say that the members of the body have sensations like the head, sympathize with and love the head, and that is *all* that is meant by their being united with the head. And does not Paul say, "Christ is the head, and ye are the members?" It is true again that the popular theology professes to believe in a life-union. But what kind of a life-union is it? It might rather be denominated a *lively* union, that is a union of *intense feeling*, in opposition to the merely outward use of forms and ceremonies or to a dead orthodoxy. A feeling union of this kind is certainly requisite and right, but to make this the only union existing between Christ and his people is to make religion altogether subjective, to make salvation depend entirely upon the workings of our own minds and hearts, being merely *assisted* in this work by divine power; is to run counter to all the analogies just considered; in short, is to substitute our feeling, or our faith, in the place of a personal Saviour. It cannot be. "Ye are saved *by grace*," only "*through* faith." The union is infinitely deeper, more glorious than a feeling-union. It is a life-union, therefore a mysterious union, unseen, unheard, unfelt. For which very reason it is a union effected, not by our faith, or by ourselves in any way, but only by God. "Not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God," "I am the true vine," says the Saviour—

full of sap, perfect, emphatically a new and complete origin of humanity—"and my father is the husbandman"—who engrafts the branches into the vine, and nurtures them. In other words, it is God alone, who by the Holy Ghost forms and maintains the union between Christ and believers.

Thus it can now be readily perceived that the great object to be accomplished by the means of grace is the formation and continuation of a mysterious life-union, imperceptible to the senses, between Christ, the Head, and individuals who are to be members. The question now is, by which of these means, specifically, does God design to effect this wondrous work, by the Word, or by the Sacraments? Not by the *Word*, that is, as we have defined it, the preaching of the Gospel; and for this plain reason. Preaching is directed to the mind or intellect with the view of moving both the affections and the will. But the moving of the affections and of the will is not reaching the life-centre of the being—the intellect or mind is not the life of man—all the thinking, feeling, or willing that one can do, though assisted in these acts by a divine power, cannot of themselves make him a new creature in Christ Jesus. This inward, radical, divine work must be accomplished, therefore, by the only other means, the *Sacraments*. The correspondence or connection between the fundamental work to be done, and the means by which it is done, is truly great, and can easily be seen. Baptism is the ordinance of this mysterious union. For it may be asked, if the union formed by the implantation of the life of Christ, expressed by the formula, "Ye in me," is a mysterious one, imperceptible to the senses, how can we know and be assured of its existence? And further, if it is brought to pass by the power of God, and that too, as no one can doubt, at some particular place or time, does this power operate at any place or time, or is it bound ordinarily to some particular divine ordinance? The water of Holy Baptism is a *sign* of the cleansing activity of the Holy Ghost, which can consist only in the inward and real application of the pure and perfect life of our Lord Jesus Christ. The water of Baptism is also a *seal*, that the thing signified, mysteriously and divinely, takes place then

and there. The very fact of a sign being given proves that a sign was needed. But no tangible element or substance would be needed as a sign and seal, if by faith or feeling, or in any other way, a man were certain of a fact. Now, as in no other ordinance than Baptism is *water*, which, undoubtedly, can only signify washing, ever used; and, as washing in a religious sense can consist only in expelling or overcoming the filth of sin by the introduction of a new life, pure and powerful, therefore it follows that Holy Baptism is the means of grace whereby the Holy Spirit ingrafts, for the first time, in any substantial sense, the believer into Christ, and thus brings him into a state of salvation. This is the sole design and benefit of this Sacrament, and there is no room for a second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth advantage to be hunted up in the popular mode as derived therefrom. If more than six reasons are given why we should submit to Baptism, the seventh is most certain to be "Because the Lord requires it." A very good reason indeed, but the very fact that He absolutely requires it, and takes for granted that no one coming to Him would ever think of neglecting and despising it, shows that there is some invisible grace connected with it that can in no way be dispensed with.

God can, if He will, bestow this grace without the use of the waters of Baptism, and not the want, but the contempt of the Sacraments condemns—nevertheless it must not be forgotten that the grace, which is the invisible part of Baptism, is absolutely necessary in all cases, and that we are bound to its divinely appointed means, unless exempted by an especial act of divine revelation.

With these views before us in reference to the one Sacrament, it will not be necessary for us to dwell long on the discussion of the other. As Baptism has reference to the introduction of life and consequent formation of a life-union, so the Lord's Supper has reference to its maintenance and growth. The process of reasoning that led us to see the necessity of an implantation of real life, would lead us to see the necessity, also, of nourishing and developing the same. The latter can be brought about only by the same divine hand that brought about

the former. The one, also, is a work as mysterious and imperceptible to the senses as the other. There is, therefore, as great a necessity for some tangible and visible sign. Bread and wine, fit emblems of nourishment and strength, are the divinely chosen signs of the body and blood of Christ, and in the Sacrament of His Supper do they become seals to the believing recipients of a real participation in His divine-human life. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." Does *eating the Saviour* mean simply believing in Him, loving Him, following Him? It may mean this, but, with all due deference to the differences of opinion with regard to the bearing of the Saviour's words recorded in the sixth chapter of John, we cannot but ask, who will say that an expression, so strong and extraordinary, can mean only this, and nothing more?

It may thus be seen that the Sacraments, as means of grace, meet the wants of man, as far as they have reference to the implantation and development of a new and higher life. But besides these, there are other human wants and necessities, just as great, that need to be satisfied and met. In the first place, all hinderances or obstacles in the way of the operation of the gracious power of God must be removed. These do not consist in an incapacity for redemption, or an unconcern for happiness, which cannot at all be ascribed to man, fallen though he is, but in the seeking of redemption and the pursuing of happiness in his own way, and by his own powers. Without the removal of these obstacles, by his coming into a sense of the vanity of his self-wrought salvation, and the impotence of his own unaided efforts, and by looking to a higher than human power for help, God will not, cannot, act at all substantially in his being. God does not deal with men but in strict accordance with their nature. That nature requires to be acted on, not arbitrarily, as on a beast or a stone, but freely and according to its own laws, as one divinely gifted with reason and will. Were God to set aside these laws, and act upon him by a mere exercise of omnipotent power, it would only be the destruction of one, and the creation of another being. The indispensable necessity of

bringing a man in a natural way to feel the need of, and to be willing to submit to divine interposition in his behalf, is thus apparent. To awaken such feelings, and draw them in the true direction, the salvation of God in Christ must be presented to the mind. This is done by means of the Word. This is the only means that addresses itself directly to the intellect. This presents to it the perfect salvation of Christ. This excites the question, "What must I do to obtain Him?" This also answers, "Believe in Him, and thou shalt be saved." It is not the mere outward proclamation of truth by man to man that produces such an effect, but it is the means by which, in this natural way, the Holy Ghost operates upon the heart of the hearer.

With these obstacles of impenitence and self-righteousness removed, the way is open for the operation of the grace of God in a substantial sense. The adult is now in the position and state of an infant. There is no impenitence, unbelief, or self-righteousness in their little hearts. It is just here where adult and infant salvation come together. The Saviour expressly teaches, that unless we turn from ourselves and the world, and *become as little children*, we can by no means enter into His kingdom of grace. No obstacles in their case being in the way, they are the regular subjects of baptismal grace, wherever there is assurance of an after Christian training, in order that pearls may not be cast before swine. It is from the baptismal font that both adult and infant start out together in the same life of grace, both being from that point only babes in Christ, but looking forward to the stature of perfect manhood in Him.

But this is not all. There are other wants on the part of man to be met and satisfied. All hinderances removed, and a new life mysteriously imparted through the appointed means, it is absolutely necessary that the subjects of such great grace should be brought to a consciousness of their high position, and be directed into the proper way of living and acting. The new life, though in itself real and active, must yet be directed, as to its manifestations, into the proper channel. Though the union between Christ and them is mysterious and incomprehensible,

yet must they come more and more to realize, every day, the intimate and endearing relation they sustain, in virtue of it, to their divine Head and Master. They must also know His will, in order that they may do only those things which are pleasing in His sight, in gratitude for what He has done for them. If in these things they fail, the Lord will surely have a right to complain, as He once did, and often does now: "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider." Nor has He left them without the necessary means for attaining to this knowledge and obedience. That means is the preaching of the Gospel. This is the means which, through the outward ear, reaches the mind and heart, and moves the will. It unfolds to the Christian, who alone can understand and appreciate them, all the beauties and depths of redemption. It brings out of its treasury things new and old. It teaches him how to walk in the ways of the Lord. It is the means of increasing his faith, encouraging his hopes, deepening his love.

From what has now been said, it will be seen that the Word, on the one hand, and the Sacraments on the other, have their own appropriate sphere of action, but stand on the same level as regards their relative importance and necessity. All this may be exhibited, as the general result which we have reached, in the following way:—The Word has to do with *truth*, the Sacraments with *life*. The one operates upon the intellect and affections, the other upon the centre of the being. By the Word, men are brought mentally and morally into contact with Christ; by the Sacraments, into actual life-contact. The Word draws men to the threshhold, Baptism is the door by which they go in; the Word induces hunger and thirst, the Lord's Supper furnishes water and bread. The Word, without the Sacraments, would be without an object, without a purpose, without an aim; the Sacraments, without the Word, would be magical, unnatural, impossible. In short, the one is the subjective means of penitence and faith; the other, the objective means of life and power.

This view of the relation between the means of grace, accords

with the teaching of the Sacred Scriptures. Especially is this apparent in the examples, which they give, of the manner in which individuals were brought into a saving relation with our Lord Jesus Christ. The first example is that furnished on the very birth-day of the Christian Church. Peter preached the Word unto the assembled multitude, by which they were led to feel the vanity of all their previous hopes, and the necessity of just such a Saviour as was now held up before them. This feeling expressed itself in the anxious question—"Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter replied: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Who will presume to say that now at this point they were in a state of salvation? If that were so, then it would follow that anxiously asking what to do, and the being told what to do, would be salvation itself, which is absurd. No; they were only now standing at the door of salvation knocking for admission. But did they remain there? By no means; but, without waiting further to be examined individually as to their inward experience or religious feelings, which, indeed, would have been impossible for even twelve ministers to do in but a part of one day in the case of three thousand persons, they were immediately brought by baptism into the position they longed for, of union with Christ by the Holy Ghost and communion with His people. "Then they that gladly received His word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." What then? Were they now perfect, simply because they were baptized? Had they nothing more to do, but fold their arms in ease? Let the Sacred Record answer. "They continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." To attend the preaching of the Gospel, to celebrate the Lord's Supper, and to engage in the public and private worship of God, was their life-long work.

The principal thing to be observed in this instance, is the fact, that the Gospel was not preached unto the three thousand day after day, for the purpose of converting them, according to the

modern idea of that term; they were not conversed with, and prayed about, and sung over, after being led by the ordinary administration of the Word to ask, what they must do—there was not sufficient time for all that—but they were the same day baptized. If this practice of the Apostles does not show that grace is conferred in Baptism, which is not conferred by the Word, it does not mean anything at all. Remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost, were connected with their Baptism, and a felt need and desire for such divine gifts were brought about by the preaching of the Gospel. Thus was it in every instance of individual salvation given in the Acts of the Apostles. When the people of Samaria "believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." When Jesus was preached to the Ethiopian eunuch, what did he desire? Why, to be baptized. For what reason? Evidently *to partake of* the salvation of the Jesus of whom he had just heard. Philip asked him whether he believed with his whole heart. He replied: "Yes, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." In this position of affairs, it does not require a very smart man to see, that this faith was only a pre-requisite *condition* to the salvation he desired, and was, therefore, not salvation itself. But now the Gospel being preached, faith being also present, and yet the desired goal not being reached, what happened? *He was baptized.* Both parties *now* seemed satisfied; for Philip went elsewhere to preach, and the eunuch went on his way *rejoicing.*

Time would fail us to consider all the cases, such as those of Lydia, of the Philippian jailor, and of Paul. The latter is strangely supposed by some to have been in a state of salvation before he was baptized. He might have been on the way to it, but by no means in it. For only think—when on the road to Damascus, Christ appeared to him, and asked why he persecuted Him. Paul asked who He was. Jesus told him, whereupon Paul further asked Him what he should do. The Saviour replied: "Go into Damascus, and there it shall be told thee." This is all that occurred between them; and yet many say that

Paul was now regenerated, united to Christ, and a Christian. No, no, he was only now knocking at the door; and hence Ananias addressed him: "Why tarry there? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." If these words do not teach that his actual entrance into the kingdom of grace, and his coming into vital contact with Christ, is connected with his Baptism, they have no meaning whatsoever. But, perhaps, some will say that this grace is not always connected even with Baptism; for the Holy Ghost had not fallen upon any of the Samaritans, although they had been baptized by Philip in the name of the Lord Jesus. To this we reply, in the first place, that if the Holy Ghost was not poured out upon them when they were baptized, He was not afterwards poured out upon them by the preaching of the Gospel at least, but by the laying on of the Apostles' hands. We reply, in the second place, that the gift conferred upon them by this laying on of hands, was not the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost, but the power of speaking with tongues; and we contend that it is the former, and not the latter, that is concerned with Baptism. Again, it may be objected that the Holy Ghost fell on Cornelius by the preaching of the Gospel, and that he was only afterwards baptized. We remark here, in the first place, that this falling of the Holy Ghost upon Cornelius and his friends, while Peter was preaching, has immediate reference, not to His regenerating or converting power, but to His power of tongues, "for they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God," which power is now not communicated at all, either by the Word or by the Sacraments. In the second place, this conferring of the power of tongues independently of the ordinary means of grace, was highly appropriate and necessary, inasmuch as this was the first fruits of the Gentile heathen world, and therefore the introduction of a new dispensation. For this reason was the extraordinary event accompanied by the extraordinary circumstances of the remarkable visions, both of Cornelius and Peter, so fully and repeatedly recorded in the Scriptures. The case of Cornelius and his friends is, in this view, altogether parallel with that

of Peter and his fellow-disciples, as he himself says—"The Holy Ghost fell on them, *as on us at the beginning.*"

Now all these examples fully show how faithfully the Apostles adhered in their practice to the commission of their ascending Saviour: "Go, disciple all nations, baptizing them, and teaching them." Their teaching, too, as well as their practice, was in strict conformity with the spirit of the same commission. All their Epistles, which form parts of the sacred Canon, take for granted, from beginning to end, that *all* the *baptized* members of the churches, which are addressed, are in a state of actual grace, and have now only to avoid all sin, and work out their salvation with fear and trembling. It is nowhere intimated that even those among them who were not as good as they might be, and who were sharply rebuked for some sins, had to be converted by being preached, prayed, and sung over, and commence their Christian life *de novo*, as if they had never been in grace; but they were exhorted to forsake their evil ways, and amend their lives, just *because of the great grace in which they stood.* Even to the Galatians Paul wrote: "For ye are *all* the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as *many* of you as have been *baptized* into Christ, have put on Christ." So everywhere. By Baptism they are brought into a real, living relationship with Christ and His salvation, by the Lord's Supper are communicated to them His body and blood, in a spiritual, real manner, to maintain and strengthen the relationship; and by the preaching of the Word they are brought to repentance and faith, into a godly walk and holy conversation. "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel," is the only passage that seems to imply that Baptism is of very little account, the great thing being preaching. But this passage and its connections, instead of teaching that Baptism is of very little use, show its absolute necessity in every case. For whilst the various offices were particularly assigned, some to the Apostles, others to their assistants, (the preaching of the Gospel, as the most difficult and laborious, in a human point of view, having been especially given to the former)—yet rather than individuals should go without Baptism, Paul even went and baptized Crispus and Gaius, and

the household of Stephanus. He was glad that he himself baptized only these few persons, not because it was not absolutely necessary, or as important as preaching to them, but as the record distinctly says, "lest any should say that I had baptized in my own name." The very fact, that he conceives a party might with some show have been called after his name, if he had *baptized* many of them, and never for a moment supposes that any one would think of making such a Pauline party by his simply having *preached* to them, shows rather that both he and the Corinthians regarded the grace of Baptism more fundamental than that of the preached Word. In the same connection it may also be observed in reference to the Lord's Supper, that in the times of the Apostles, when the disciples met together for the worship of God, while at such times the Gospel was preached unto them, the prime object was always the breaking of bread. (Acts xx. 7).

But there are some passages of Scripture, which seem to ascribe to the Word the grace that specifically belongs to the Sacraments alone. Among these are the words of our Saviour: "Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy Word is truth;" the words of James: "Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth;" the words of Peter: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever;" and the words of Paul: "That He might sanctify and cleanse the Church with the washing of water by the Word." In these passages, and others of similar form, it is necessary to remember that, as we stated in the beginning, the "Word" sometimes means the personal Word, and sometimes the spoken word or power of God, as well as the preaching of the Gospel. In what sense is it used in the passages just quoted? For our present purpose it is necessary, not so much to specify in what particular sense it is used in each passage, as to show that it is *not* used in the sense of the *preaching* of the Gospel. That Peter does *not* use it in the latter sense is clear, without further controversy, from the fact that he says it "liveth and abideth forever," which cannot be affirmed of preaching." As to the language of our Saviour's prayer, how can any one,

acquainted with the terminology of John, interpret it so as to mean, "Sanctify us through Thy truth; Thy *preaching* is truth." With John, Christ is Himself the Truth. "I am the Truth." Christ therefore prays that His disciples may be sanctified, by the communication, not of doctrine or abstract truth, but of *Himself*, the personal Truth, as well as personal Word. Truth, separated from the *person* of Christ, has no sanctifying power. So must, also, the language of St. James be understood. St. Paul, in the passage above quoted, merely gives us the outward sign, and the inward power of Baptism—the washing of water, and the word; that is, the quickening power, or energy of God. It is but the Apostolic forerunner of the patristic formula, "Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum." It is a remarkable and unmistakable testimony to the importance and force of Holy Baptism.

Besides the Scriptural view, we are also concerned to know how this subject is represented in the Heidelberg Catechism. The relation existing between the Word and the Sacraments is stated in these Words:—"The Holy Ghost works faith in our hearts, by the preaching of the Holy Gospel, and confirms it by the use of the Holy Sacraments." *Working* faith must be different, therefore, from *confirming* faith. What is the difference? The difference cannot be, that the one is to bring about faith in the first place, and the other to keep it up afterwards in the same direction. In that case there would be no call for Sacraments, as the Word, which is designed and calculated as a means both to originate and increase faith, can and does do, in such sense, its own confirming. No; faith is wrought in us by the Word in one way and direction, but confirmed by the Sacraments in quite another. A new wick in a lamp will burn brightly for a time, though there be no oil in the lamp; but it can be kept burning, not by adding more flame above, but only by pouring in oil below. A man may, through the Word, be led to believe in Christ; but through the Sacraments a new life must be imparted to him in the very centre of his being, in order that this latter, besides being an end in itself, may give substance even to faith itself; and then, unlike the lamp, new

flame by the Word may be continually added above, that faith may grow brighter and brighter. That such is the grace of the Sacraments, the Catechism clearly teaches. In Baptism, we have "the forgiveness of sins from God, through grace, for the sake of Christ's blood, which He shed for us on the cross; and also, are renewed by the Holy Ghost, and sanctified to be members of Christ, that so we may more and more die unto sin, and lead holy and unblamable lives." Hence it does not for a moment hesitate or scruple to call Baptism "the washing of regeneration, and the washing away of sins." In the Lord's Supper, we are "so united more and more to His sacred body by the Holy Ghost, who dwells both in Christ and in us, that although He is in heaven, and we on the earth, we are nevertheless flesh of His flesh and bone of His bones, and live and are governed by one Spirit, as members of the same body are by one soul." This is the grace of the Sacrament; while the grace of the preaching of the Gospel is faith, which consists in "a *hearty trust*, that not only to others, but to me also, forgiveness of sins, everlasting righteousness and salvation, *are freely given by God*, merely of grace, only for the sake of Christ's merits." This is the teaching of the Catechism respecting these means of grace separately taken, which must always be kept in mind, when it is desired to understand fully the meaning of the language, by which it expresses the relation between them. But that there may be no room for mistake, the Catechism undertakes to express that relation in the following more unmistakable terms:— "The Holy Ghost *teaches* in the Gospel, and by the Holy Sacraments *assures* us, that our whole salvation stands in the one sacrifice of Christ made for us on the cross." Again, it says that by the use of the Sacraments, the Holy Ghost "not only more fully declares, but *seals* to us the promise of the Gospel."

We may be permitted to say, in conclusion, that the subject is eminently a practical one. The manner in which we administer the means of grace, depends very much on the views we entertain with regard to their specific nature, and their relation to each other. If, on the one hand, our theory leads us to subordinate the Word to the Sacraments, it may bring us to a depen-

dence on outward ceremonies, and a denial of saving faith, and give us no rest at last until we find it in the unbloody sacrifice of the Roman mass. If, on the other hand, our theory leads us to subordinate the Sacraments to the Word, it may lead us away from the truth and the life as they are in Christ Jesus, to a religion that exists in our own feelings and fancies, hurry us on to religious extravagance and fanaticism, and land us in downright rationalism in the end. The latter is the tendency and danger of the times; the former occurs mostly in the way of reaction. All that is necessary, according to the latter theory, is to preach the Gospel with pungency and power, to single out those who by that means have become anxious and distressed,—to sing, pray, and talk with and for them, until they are brought to a state of mental ease (a process which has not the shadow of a Scriptural precedence), and then all is done, except that it is very good now to be baptized, join the Church, and commune, because the Bible says these things must be done, too. If these latter things are attended to in their proper order and spirit, we might be induced to pass by, without much objection, even the false issue presented to the mind in the former process; but how often do we see the latter undervalued, altogether neglected, or observed out of their proper order! To avoid the Scylla and Charybdis on either hand, it is only necessary to maintain and carry out the view that neither one is subordinate to the other; that the Word has *its grace*, and the Sacraments *their grace;* that both are indispensable; that one is subjective or experimental grace, the other objective or sacramental; and that as we have a natural life imperceptible to the senses, and yet have feeling too, so we can have a spiritual life imperceptible to the senses, and yet have religious feeling too. This theory will lead us to baptize all infants of Christian parents, and all adults who desire the salvation of Christ, to preach them the Gospel, that they may be directed in the path of penitence, and faith, and of good-living, and administer to them from time to time the most comfortable Sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ. The font and the altar should occupy in the Sanctuary of the Lord's house, as prominent a place as the

pulpit. The Sacramental altar demands a central position, and immediately in front of it the baptismal font; there is no meaning in placing this latter at one side, to balance a reading-desk on the other. The reading-desk is a mere convenience for holding the books at the right side of the altar, from which all our worship should ascend to heaven. The pulpit requires a prominent position, either behind the font and the altar, or at their side, in order that the preacher may be able to point the world to the one, and the people of God to the other.

Art. IV.—THE ESSENCE AND THE FORM OF CHRISTIANITY.

Those who hold to the peculiar type of theology which this Review seeks to develop and advance, firmly believe, and would as modestly as possible say, that they have some wholesome things to say to the theological public. From some demonstrations, however, called forth by our former issues, we have reason to doubt whether our common American Protestantism is in a much better temper to hear what we have to say than it was a score of years ago. This does neither alarm nor discourage us. This theology has never professed to be of the same type with that around it. If, as a Church, our theology is not distinctive and peculiar to itself, we have most certainly neither right nor mission to labor and teach as apart from other denominations. It not only differs, but it differs widely from the whole Puritan scheme. Nothing, therefore, is gained either to the reviewers of it, or to us, nor yet to the general cause of sound theology, by merely attempting to show this. All this is already publicly acknowledged and claimed. To us the whole interest is too solemn to allow us, like the bat, to play animal among animals, and fowl among fowls. Our Christological theology is distinctive. Let all understand this fully and finally, and thus save themselves the useless pains of measuring it by their own.

In saying this we do not ask men to let us think and decide for them, but only respectfully invite them to study with us what are regarded as the momentous problems of the times. We are engaged upon the questions which concern the essential nature of Christianity, and these also, as we conceive, lie at the very foundations of Protestantism; and they vitally affect the questions at issue between Protestantism and Romanism. These are the only live questions in theology at the present time. With some this whole matter is already fully and satisfactorily decided. We do not agree with them. For us the present popular theology decides nothing in regard to them. That leading men in the Protestant or Roman Church, should think so, and thus sit in dignified rest, is to us the saddest aspect of the case. To us this whole question appears, just at this time, to press as never before. The pressure which began to be felt by earnest minds, in Germany, England, and this country, more than a quarter of a century ago, increases every day, whether men admit it or not. The charge of Romanizing, as made against those who are alive to this great question, is no argument, decides nothing, defends nothing, condemns nothing, is worn out, and has lost both its novelty and power. We have never cared for it. Like the nursery cry of "a man in the dark," it can only be successfully practised upon theological children. Of the cruelty inflicted upon the unthinking by thus playing with their religious prejudices, we will not speak.

We work at this problem, not for the sake of indulging in theological curiosity, but because we clearly see that God, in History, is working at it. There are times in the history of Christianity, when certain great questions press for a decision. If they cannot be decided by human wisdom and learning, they will be decided by "God in History," awakening and enlisting the co-operation of men.

Of this fact, the history of the world furnishes abundant examples. We have one near us. For several decades before the outbreak of the late Rebellion, the question of human slavery pressed upon the minds of our statesmen with a power that would not be put off. Our wisest men thought, wrote, planned, and

proposed, but no scheme for the settlement of the question could be presented which seemed to meet the case. Our statesmen were at their wit's end. Then war became the mighty word of God! God decided by actual history what no wisdom of our statesmen could decide for the country.

A similar burden is upon the Church. The question between Protestantism and Romanism is pressing for adjustment. There seems, however, no probability of a decision of it in the schools alone. We know that nothing is more difficult than to read "the signs of the times," yet one cannot help but feel that the status of the European nations—by no means settled—indicate that "God in History" is about to awaken newly, and irresistibly urge forward the theological mind to a decision. Though the late military movement seems, on the surface, to have been only for civil and political ends, yet it is plain that the Christian element is at the bottom of it, though it may be unconsciously so to many of the actors. It could be easily shown that the cause of the late Prussian-Austrian war lies at least a century back in history. Protestantism on the continent, and with it the German nationality, were demoralized by Rationalism, ever since English Deism, through French sensualism, and French life and manners, had found its way to the Prussian Court of Frederick the Great, through the plausible and skeptical Voltaire, and thence down to all lower court circles, till at last all polite Germany was found talking, dressing, dancing French, and thus had their manners, their thinking, their Christianity, and their nationality, all poisoned by a foreign spirit. Thus the demoralization went forward till Germany, if it did not forget to know, at least almost altogether ceased to feel that it was Germany. During the last decades Rationalism has been fast on the wane, and a revived theology and Christianity have taken hold of the German mind and heart. With this revival in the Protestant consciousness must come back the German nationality to a corresponding consciousness. No nation has ever felt so deeply as the German that their nationality rests in their religion. For

Was ist des Deutschen Faterland?
So nennen endlich wir das Land!
So weit die Deutsche Zunge klingt
Und Gott im Himmel Lieder singt!

This late war was, in its deepest ground, a struggle for the freedom of the revived Protestant consciousness, and with it a strike for the old glorious German nationality. As now partially restored by the success of Prussia, it is a master for France. Its successes have humbled old fogy Austria, and very plainly demoralized the old continental Dictator. That a German power could—that it *dared* twice to say flatly "no" to French suggestions, is a new thing in Europe, and a thing to be thought of. The foundation for a full restoration of the German Protestant nationality is now fairly laid in the success of Prussia. Whether the present difficulty between Prussia and France leads to war or not, is in itself unimportant. If the war occur, it will be the very power that shall consolidate Germany; if France backs out, the humiliation and demoralization of that Roman Catholic power will have the same effect upon the nationality and Protestant spirit of Germany.

Rome sees the ultimate bearing of all these significant signs of the times. Some one writes:

"The Roman Catholics of France, particularly the Ultramontanes, are deeply chagrined by the recent events in Europe. It is not alone the defeat of a Catholic prince, involving the loss of all hope of revolutionizing Italy, that brings them to grief, but they are stung by the cause to which the public sentiment traces the results. The fact is constantly brought forward that, for the last three centuries, Romanism has proved an element of weakness and decline in all the States which have surrendered themselves to its influence; and that, on the other hand, countries which have embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, have grown in strength and prosperity. Spain is compared with England, Sicily with Scotland, Portugal with Holland, etc. When in reply, the case of France is cited, the history of that nation from the time of Francis I., is appealed to, to show that whenever France has been in alliance with Pro-

testants, she has concluded advantageous treaties of peace; but whenever she has taken up arms to support the Papacy, she has been conquered and humiliated. It is further said, that if France occupies an elevated rank among the European Powers, and if her soldiers have gained memorable victories, it is because for eighty years, notwithstanding that they were nominally Roman Catholics, they have, by their laws, their ideas, their tendencies, and their actions, ceased to be so. It is also said of Italy, that she began to be great and strong only when separating her institutions and interests from those of the Vatican. The most influential organs of the French press, among them the *Journal des Debats*, have made this remark: 'Austria is *clerical* (that is to say, Popish), she must either undergo a change or die; she can no longer exist as she is.'"

Another extract may show how foreign Romanists themselves view the situation as brought about the late military events in Europe:

"There is an article in the Ultramontanist Journal, the *Monde*, of Paris, of some interest. It states what must be the result, as regards Rome, of the overthrow of Austria. 'No State will remain depending upon the Vicar of Jesus Christ.' All will have abjured the official character of the Catholic faith. The mass of the Catholics in France, Spain, and Germany, will let fall the throne of Pio Nono, that visible sign of the Catholicity of the nations. If Austria be vanquished, 'she will close the Catholic cycle of modern people.' This is probably a true anticipation. The old Catholic ideal of Church and State is likely soon to be but an idea—the terrible ecclesiastical tyranny that has so long oppressed Christendom, forever disappearing. And the paper says:—'There are not wanting zealous Protestants in Berlin and elsewhere, who take a grim interest in the fact that by the defeat at Sadowa, the House of Hapsburg "met its doom" on the very ground where, some two hundred and fifty years ago, Ferdinand II. so ruthlessly stamped out the Protestantism and the freedom of Bohemia. It is said, indeed, that a Berlin pastor of rank predicted the victory on that field a fortnight before the event. After the battle of Weissenberg, in

1620, the Emperor systematically labored to extirpate the new religion and its professors.'"

Restless desperation is always an evidence of a consciousness of weakness. This was manifested on the part of the Romanists on the occasion of the late defeat of the Roman party in Belgium:

"During the June election of members of the two houses of the Legislature, the Ultramontanes made a desperate effort to secure the control of those bodies, and thus force the Government into illiberal measures toward the Protestants. Parish priests denounced the Liberals from the pulpit, and threatened with everlasting torments those who should vote for them. On the day of election they accompanied their parishioners to the balloting, and watched their voting. As usual, they carried their zeal to the excess which insures a rebound. All the result of their efforts was to bring the cause of religion into contempt, and to leave their party in a minority in both branches. If this madness of Romanism reacted only upon itself, it would be less deplorable. But Belgium is fast becoming the meeting-place for all the schools of infidelity on the continent, and such exhibitions make their unhappy disciples none the fewer."

We know full well that all that appears in the signs of the times, and that seems to make against Rome, is neither pure Protestantism, pure Christianity, nor pure Patriotism. We think of the declarations of the notorious Gavazzi, who, when he preached his crusade of liberty through this country some years ago, said: "I am no Catholic! I am no Protestant! I am no destroyer!" This element deeply flows in the minds of many who are politically pitted against Rome. But it shows that those nationalities which have become effete under Roman forms of Christianity, are earnestly asking whether they must utterly die in their present status, or whether they must strike for some kind of hope, if it even be in the still darker abyss of infidelity.

The question between Romanism and Protestantism as it now presses for a decision, is not a question alone of theology and Christianity in a direct way, but it is also a question of civiliza-

tion, of freedom, of life and progress for the nations—and especially is it such in those nations that are, as a clear fact, pining and dying under the shadow of Roman Christianity. This fact is a more powerful, practical argument against Rome, than any ever presented by universities. Whether they do it as Protestants or as infidels; whether they do it by right or by wrong, the nations will ask, are now earnestly asking, whether by continued papal allegiance their effete and pining nationalities can rise and live again. If neither Romish nor Protestant theologians can answer the question theoretically and practically, they will have an answer still. If not for the sake of those who so earnestly ask, or for the sake of those who are not able to answer the earnest inquiry, still for the sake of Christianity and the Church of the Future, God will answer the question by the "logic of events," by the voice of history.

We believe He will do it soon. The mighty word which David hurled against Saul, is in all ages a true and fitting word, showing how God can open the path of history, and lay bare of accumulated rubbish the true foundations of safety and progress for the Church and for the nations. "The Lord thundered in the heavens, and the Highest gave His voice. Yea, He sent out His arrows, and scattered them; and He shot out His lightnings, and discomfited them. Then the *channels* of waters *were* seen; and *the foundations of the world were discovered* at Thy rebuke. O Lord, at the blast of the breath of Thy nostrils!"

We do not say *how* God will decide this great question. We only say, "Man's necessity is His opportunity;" and that the very pressure of the question indicates that He, and He alone, can and will decide it. The signs now are favorable to Protestantism; at least they indicate that the Romish system must suffer itself to be fundamentally modified, a thing which it has hitherto resisted with inflexible determination. But we need not determine what the "foundations" that He will "discover" shall be, or what the "channel" of the future history of Christianity shall be. Let us only wait, and still pray: "Thy kingdom come;" and while we believe that "the Lord reigneth," we may humbly re-

joice in hope of the glory which shall be revealed in the "Church of the Future."

Amid these earnest movements of the age, can theology sit still and complacently enjoy its *otium cum dignitate?* Can Protestantism, which, by its divisions, seems so illy ready to take the conduct of history, afford to stand in mere empty wonder before the mountain chewing over and over again its own cud, or flippantly enter the fray to welcome the mighty movement with the music of that old wheel upon which it is spinning over again its dry, brittle, and short traditions? Is it ready to meet these new creative momenta of history with its old and finished theology? Not so do we estimate the demands of the times. The theology needed is not finished and at hand. As more or less in all ages, so especially now is theology called to a new travail, that it may bring into the unity of science, and prepare for the demands of history, the full power, capacity, and scope of Christianity, which it has ever been able to apprehend only "in part." To this end it must, as ever, vary its standpoint, in the hope of finding that central, imperial principle, out of which all Christian truth grows forth, to which it is all harmoniously related, and in right adjustment with which it will both illuminate the centre, and be in turn illuminated by it. This is our problem. It is this that constitutes the peculiarity of our views in theology.

It will be our aim in the present article, to attempt an *orientirung*—as the Germans say—in our present position,—show what has necessitated such position, and indicate how, as we believe, it throws light upon some of the most important, central, and earnest theological questions of the age.

Two great questions, to which all others are subordinate, are in this age pressing for answer. Two questions which are, however, only different sides of one and the same question. The questions are these: What is the *essence*, and what is the essential *form* of Christianity?

Both these questions will be ultimately decided by the historical development of Christianity itself. It will at last surely realize its essential nature in true form. But it will do this

through the devout and willing co-operation of Christians; and it is both our duty and our privilege to forecast its essential nature and form, in order that we may work truly to facilitate the process of its own self-realization.

Without attempting here at once an answer to the questions proposed in the way of a definition of the essence and form of Christianity, we wish first to attend to a brief historical review, out of which, as we intend, a substantial definition shall grow.

Christianity is *one*. There are many religions, but there are not many Christianities. No view of its essence or form can be for a moment entertained without the appreciation of this primal character of Christianity. Any theological or ecclesiastical antagonisms that will not or cannot subordinate themselves to this essential idea, are false; and any religious movements or tendencies in which this idea is ignored, or not kept consciously in view, are mere fitful and sporadic impulses in the dark—or what the Germans so expressively call "*Einspännerei*"—persons wildly and lawlessly driving their own solitary vehicles.

Christianity is one. It is, however, not one as a *unit*, but one as a *unity*. It is an expansive and a progressive unity; not a unit in a point, but a unity in and over *space;* not a unit at rest, but a unity extending through and over *time*, a unity in life and history.

Now, when Christianity first began to extend in space, and to move onward in time, thus to secure ultimate possession of the world in both its conditions of space and time, the great problem arose, How shall the one essence manifest itself in *form?* What shall, and what must be the form of that unity which is ever extending through space, and ever progressing through time? What shall be the form of that unity which can be maintained in the absolutely necessary diversity and manifoldness of space and time, of geography and history?

Gradually the theory grew into power that Christianity, in order to maintain its unity in its extension and perpetuity, must have an ecclesiastical centre in space—Rome; an ecclesiastical head of its own subjects—the Pope. To this fixed centre in space—Rome, and to this infallible perpetual central line of

tactual succession through time in the persons of the popes, the extension of Christianity to its utmost periphery, and every manifold progress of it in its history, was supposed to be inflexibly bound.

The ecclesiastical constitution thus formed claimed for itself to be *jure divino*, first and last, the true, only, and ultimate form of the Body of Christ.

This form of Christianity, and this theory of its unity, maintained itself under more or less pressure upon it by tendencies toward the periphery in the form of sects and heresies more or less powerful, through one thousand years of history. That it became more mere power *over* human wills, and less a power *in* human wills, is claimed by Protestants, admitted by many of the most learned and honest Romanists, and is clearly demonstrated by the actual facts of history. It failed to hold the Christian world in unity. For whence did the Reformation come? Did it spring up full-fledged, and at once, like Minerva out of the head of Jupiter? Was it not nursed to life in the bosom of Romanism? Did not Roman life—for there existed no other—create its necessity, and give it existence from its own womb? As a life out of Rome's own life it broke forth from its own bosom, and asserted for itself new rights, cast itself into new forms, and created for itself a new history,—a life, moreover, which was at the time, and has since been identified with the most fresh and vigorous nationalities, has continued to control and advance them, and has in the year just past, on the very soil where the original ecclesiastical battle was fought, by the civil and military power of Prussia, limited, humbled, and in a great degree demoralized, the two ruling nationalities of the Papacy, France and Austria; and even Italy, the seat of the Papacy, itself in semi-antagonism to its long papal nursing, has attained, in some measure at least, its longed-for freedom and expansion of national honor and power, only by the power and influence of its Protestant ally—having exhibited in its own military weakness that demoralization which its national life has suffered in its long bondage under absolute and arbitrary power.

The results reached—the status effected, by this sudden, quick, and significant demonstration in the history of Europe, is not a fixed status. The end is not yet. We know full well that nothing is more difficult to read than "the signs of the times." Nor have we any capacity or call to prophecy. Yet we need not look forward into the enigmatical future, but only back into history, to learn and see that there are great questions, which philosophy and theology can, indeed, earnestly ask and discuss, but which, as we have already intimated, Christ in History alone can decide. History proves abundantly, in all its long annals, that war is also a mighty word of God. By it He not only breaks stubborn nations, but also stubborn systems. By it He sets free human thoughts and human hearts from colossal and overshadowing forms of error. In war God enlightens and blinds cabinets, commands and confounds armies. By its overturnings He removes the rubbish with which human ambition has barricaded the path of history, and lays bare to view again the foundations of human progress.

Such terrible intervention of God in the affairs of earth, is only a last resort. It comes in when human power and human wisdom fail, and when problems of human history, before which the wisest and most earnest stand confounded, *must be resolved.* Of such interventions, at such crises, the history of the world is full.

Such a burden is now upon the world's history. The Church is in travail. It has a question before it which its own wisdom and councils fail to answer. The question is a fundamental one. What is the *essence*, and what is the *form* of Christianity? This is substantially the question between Romanism and Protestantism. It presses for a decision. It will not be put off. It rests not only on the earnest theological mind, it involves in it the peace and progress of the nations; it is, as we have said, a question of civilization and civil freedom, as well as of theoretical and practical theology. The vigorous Protestant nationalities, on the other hand, stand alarmed at their very success in "subduing" and ruling the earth. Floating on the high tide of material prosperity, carrying a crusade of freedom against almost

every form of authority, dashing forward as by steam and lightning, making antiquated to-day what was but yesterday new, casting Christianity and Christian society into new forms, and giving free play to individual wills—no wonder that the most earnest in Church and State lift up their hands in fear and warning, and ask whether these rapids do not betoken an abyss near at hand, where all may be dashed to pieces.

In short, such is the position of things in Europe especially, and in the whole Christian world generally, that history, and God in history, must soon decide the question between Romanism and Protestantism. In their present position of antagonism they cannot long continue, in their present form, side by side. Can history go back three hundred years, and stultify itself? Shall the main flow of the world's life be remanded back under the inflexible rule of Rome, whose lust for civil power, in its most arbitrary form, is as great now as it ever was; and which, in its religious dogmas, instead of having been modified and moulded by the protests of Protestantism, have only been farther elaborated in the direction of stronger and sharper antagonisms? Does Romanism, fastened as it is to the effete life of the world—a state of the nations effected in its own bosom—show that it can take care of the world and the Church, both of which it still proposes to rule from its old centre—Rome? To us it is not given so to believe.

The signs of the times seem to indicate that, whatever may be its faults and present inadequacies, history will yet vindicate the great movement of the sixteenth century as a legitimate growth from the true root of Christianity, and which will yet modify, if not draw into itself, the remaining life of the old trunk, which still stands in uncompromising antagonistic intolerance by its side. If it be so that Protestantism shall stand the test in the arbitrament of God in history, as being substantially the main bearer of the Christian life, it is plain that it cannot do so on the sole basis on which it started, or on the basis of what it has since been or now is, but alone on the basis of what it has the power of yet becoming, by virtue of that very free-

dom and flexibility of life and form which it has itself so powerfully asserted as over against Rome.

Who that assumes in good faith the divine right of this movement, and has the firmest confidence in its legitimacy, can hold at the same time that it has as yet attained to its ultimate form? History makes haste slowly. More than five hundred years passed by before Christianity was moulded into the Roman type; and those centuries are crowded with struggles, tendencies, divisions, and multitudinous aberrations. If Romanism required such length of time to reach its own approved form, there need be no impatience with the Protestant movement, if, in three hundred years, it as yet presents no finally satisfactory or conclusive results.

The history of Protestantism shows abundantly, that it has not, in any stage of its history, been satisfied with its own results. But it has shown itself to be an earnest and a free power—earnest in grappling with weighty problems in theology and philosphy, and free to discard and rid itself of any vicious elements, which have sought to mingle with and shape its progress. In its apprehension of the essence of Christianity, it has shown itself a master for Rationalism, as the spirit of a vicious freedom. It has also surmounted antichristian Pantheism. It has also always had power to save itself from being evaporated by an unchurchly spiritualistic pietism. Though all these elements of lurking mischief and threatening danger are still widely at work in its bosom, especially in practical forms, they have all been theologically surmounted and left behind.

In its efforts at recovery from these fundamentally false tendencies in its own bosom, it has partially fallen into opposite tendencies—tendencies which, instead of seeking a higher and surer form for Protestantism by pushing forward, have been disposed to surrender the interest, and go back. Thus, we have in Germany, a tendency which hopes to find a solution for the afflictions of Protestantism in the forms of primal Lutheranism—the school of Stahl and Hengstenberg, at present again most vigorously at work in the Prussian Church. In England, we have the Tractarian, or the Puseyistic School, which hopes in

a repristination of the essence of Christianity into the forms of the first five centuries of Christendom. These two have their echoes in America; the one in High-Church Episcopalianism, and the other in what, for want of a better name, we may call Old Lutheran Ecclesiasticism. The same tendency, in a less prominent way, and with feebler power, runs through almost all Protestant denominations. Thus Presbyterianism has its *old* school. Methodism has a side, which leans toward the primitive. Free Congregationalism, Unitarianism, and Universalism, have their primitive and conservative sides, the advocates of which think that these forms have not become better, but worse, by progress. Even Quakers have their orthodox conservatives, who seek to bridle back the progressives; the Mennonites have their old school; and the Dunkards their ancient men, who fear modernization.

In fact, it is evident that learned Tractarianism, and equally learned German repristinating High Lutheranism, are merely scientific exponents of a tendency that runs through Protestantism in all its forms and departments—a tendency more or less clearly felt and apprehended. But if we hold, as we surely must, that the early period of Protestantism was the period of its infancy, and not its full and ultimate form, then it is clear that all such movements toward repristination are candidates for petrifaction and fossil cabinets. Life has no such movement. All forms of history that begin to stagger backward, are in search of graves. The true heroes of history are those who keep facing frontward, and not those who seek safety and rest by flight from the battle.

Such schemes of Protestant repristination are the veriest pedantry. That they are a vain refuge, is shown by the fact that the most earnest and most deeply thinking men, who have fallen into this current, have found in the end that logical consistency requires them to carry their repristination still farther back, and demands an actual going over into Romanism.

All such churchism in Protestantism, just like Roman churchism itself, must fail to furnish an ultimate solution of the problem in regard to the essential essence and form of Christianity, simply

because it is churchism, and nothing more. It stops in the *form* of Christianity, and does not apprehend its essence as it lies back of the form. It rests in a churchly Christianity, instead of going back to its ultimate Christological basis. This ecclesiasticism heads in a Pope, cardinals, and bishops—in a Luther, Calvin, or Henry the VIII., instead of heading in the living Christ. In its zeal for a pope, it forgets that Christ is still alive. In its listening to cardinals and bishops, it forgets that the apostolic word is still the heritage of Christianity; and in its ardent desire for the rest of a fixed Christianity, in the primitive form of Protestantism of whatever type, it forgets that in all forms of life, and in all developments of history, the more perfect is always toward the end, and not toward the beginning.

Finding no solution for our problem in these repristinating tendencies, shall we find it in a purely opposite direction? Must we hope in the disintegrating, unmoored, floating, and dwindling impulses, on the extreme left of Protestantism? God forbid! These are not fresh currents of history, but only stagnating pools by its side, whose progress is the sending forth of pestilential breath, and the breeding of vile and useless things of life. Or to use another figure, they are the bewildered eddies, which, by their very wildness, prove the powerful sweep of the stream that moves majestically by.

What, then, does our own position offer? It is the peculiarity of Mercersburg Theology, that it alike refuses surrender to both the tendencies now briefly reviewed. It professes to have found, and to hold, a ground that can conserve the truth, and cast off the error inherent in both tendencies. It claims that its system is emphatically old, and just as emphatically new. It is highly conservative, and yet truly radical and progressive. It is truly catholic, and as truly protestant. It is bound by authority, and yet free. It looks back and forward, and professes to find in the womb of the old past the potencies and elements for the history and Church of the future.

The harmony of these antinomies, the unity of these paradoxes, it finds in its views of the essence of Christianity. This it finds, not in law, not in truth primarily, not in feeling, nor

in form of any kind, but in the idea of life. To it, Christianity is primarily and essentially a life. It is the divine-human life of Jesus Christ, the God-man. As Christianity begins in Him, so it stands perennially in Him. He is its perpetual fountain and principle. He did not leave our humanity, nor the world, in His ascension, so as to be away from it; but, on the other hand, only the more really, widely, and perennially to enter into it, in and through the Holy Ghost. As He is the life of Christianity and the Church, so He is also the perpetual Head, and centre, and bond of unity. Himself the central life of humanity, which is to be renewed and glorified in Him, that life furnishes a presence and a unity for all extension in space, and for all progress in history. He needs no Rome and no Vicar, because He is neither dead nor absent. He is the Æon of all æons—the Unity of all unities—the perennial Presence and Fulness of all manifoldness and diversity—the perpetual and absolute Source of all authority, and the Principle of universal freedom and progress.

Regarding the essence of Christianity as a life, it holds that it is not absolutely outwardly dependent on fixed forms—that these are not created to its hand *ad extra*, but that it perennially creates its own forms. Though it does not sunder life and form, it holds that the life is master over the form. Hence it may and does change its form by its own free presence, even as all life, in its onwardly progressing stages, requires one form to pass forward into another. It will, therefore, know of no fixed and finished ecclesiasticism. It requires no tactual handing down of the life in fixed form; it leaves the free life to provide for its own perpetual self-attestation, and sees in the changing forms of Christianity only the free, self-adjusting power of the Christian life, and its truly catholic aptitude for almost unlimited individualization and adaptation to that manifoldness and diversity, which always characterizes life.

It holds that the Church, as His body, is the form of the presence of His life—that it is a mediation of His life, not a vicarate of it—and that in any form it may assume, its legitimacy is to be attested, not so much by any outward chain of

witnesses, as by the self-attesting presence of the life of Christ. Christianity attests the Church, not the Church Christianity. When it reads lists purporting to be lines of successions, and which propose to furnish us with evidence of a legitimate line of the Christian life, it doubts and fears; but when it sees the grand fact of Christianity as it lies before it through the ages of Christian history, a living, continuous life in the world, it feels assured that the presence of such a fact is a better witness than any records of tactual succession can furnish. The logic of life is to it the highest and surest logic. When the full-grown oak of a thousand years stands before it, it accepts the fact none the less because it has not at hand outward witnesses of the subordinate fact, that it has actually passed, in unbroken continuity of life, through all the stages which lie between the acorn and its present majestic form and proportions.

It sees, in all forms of life, how free life is, and yet how bound. Nothing so free as life, and yet nothing so bound. The life creates the form, shapes the form, changes the form, and yet binds itself to the form in unbroken identity and continuity. It recognizes the same phenomena in the life of Christ. Hence it has no sympathy with the Roman theory of holding up its finished and fixed forms as the only medium and measure of the Christian life, attempting to compress its growing development into moulds of other ages, which its free life has long since outgrown, ever putting new wine into old bottles—thus making the form a bondage to the life. Nor, on the other hand, can it go with those who propose to emancipate the Christian life from its forms, giving it the intangibility and frightful freedom of a ghost.

It holds Christianity to be catholic—catholic in space, and catholic in time. Catholic, because it is the absolute life of the world. Catholic, not because it has one inflexible form, in all space and in all time, but catholic because it is the same life in manifoldness and diversity of form in all lands and in all ages, approaching man and communities on their own level and in their own estate, not as a patronizing Pharisee in starched attitude, presenting a fixed pattern for his moulding, but ever like

Christ Himself, taking the form of a servant, and, like St. Paul, ready to become all things to all men. This is its catholicity. It does not appear in the Sunday dress of theory, but in the substantial every day working garments of theological and practical life.

Thus it is to the honor of our Theology, that, on the one hand, it is charged with a backward tendency toward Rome; and, on the other hand, it is characterized as a bold and free movement forward beyond the traditionary bounds of all that is called orthodoxy in Protestantism. It is branded, now as a conspiracy with Rome, and now as in league with the boldest dash of pantheism. While some see in it the resurrection of antiquated dogmas, others see in it only the wildest vagaries of modern German speculation. This apparent contradiction is all explained by the fact that it holds Christianity as a life, in which this same antinomic phenomenon appears. Life is the unity of antagonisms. The root-life and the fruit-life are opposite movements. But the antagonism only proves the high character of the unity. As the root-life extends, the fruit-life extends. The vigor and health of the one depend upon the vigor and health of the other. As we grow backward in history, so may we grow forward into history. As the fruit-life needs the root-life, so does true progress need the past. In proportion as our theology is old, has it the power, the right, and the call to be new. As far as it reverences the old does it fulfil the fifth commandment, honoring its father and mother, and has, therefore, also its promise, which is that its days shall be long in the land which the Lord our God hath given it.

In this one central Christological truth our theology substantially stands. Upon those, who, leaving this out of view, are controverting about subordinate matters, we look as being engaged in small and fruitless quarrels. What are the questions about government and polity, which have divided Protestantism, and now still keep it apart?—and the very names of which are the banners of battle—as Episcopacy, Papacy, Presbytery, Congregationalism? What are all these, but a stirring among the shells of the nut, after the kernel is gone? These peripheric

forms of Christianity, like all shells, are all good, if the kernel be in them; they are all bad, if the essence of the Christian life has not formed them, and is still filling them out with its essence and life. We can have no interest in this vain battology.

To us the first question is concerning the essence of Christianity, assured that it will perennially create its own forms. If we have the acorn to plant, we know that its life will present the proper form through all the stages of its development. If we have the true Christological principle of theology, we may be sure that we have our light in the centre which radiates upon all. In Him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. He filleth all in all. His divine-human person is the centre of all theological science; for in Him is life, and that life is the light of men.

Art. V.—THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH IN THE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.

BY REV. THOMAS S. JOHNSTON, D. D., LEBANON, PA.

There are periods in every man's life, when the lines of thought, or duty, on which he has moved, cross one another, and he stands at the intersection, not knowing which he ought to follow.

In matters where moral duty is involved, cases arise, which cannot be governed by the laws or rules he is habitually and usually guided by; and the art of casuistry has been digested into method, that by its helping rules cases of conscience may be decided. Whenever any case of conscience arises the moral faculty is placed at the intersection of two rules or laws, and the difficulty is to determine which rule or law we ought to follow in the instance before us. But difficulties of a like kind may arise, not only in matters of moral obligation, but also in questions of speculative interest. And in no case of speculative interest, does there arise anything like the difficulty which besets the question of the inspiration of the Scriptures. The question, which, at first sight, would seem to command our

most earnest attention, that is, the interpretation of Scripture, and the proper understanding of it, is fast losing its interest.

The clash of commentators, the hissing and effervescing folly of sects and sermonizers, in their expositions of Scripture, have so degraded the business of expounding the Scriptures in the estimation of men of intelligence and thought, that they have gone back to the text of the Bible itself, and have demanded to know on what grounds the inspiration of the Bible is asserted, and what is meant by that inspiration.

It is a grave question. No one can wonder that it has been started. It might have been urged, even if the world had clung to one, uniform, and traditional interpretation of the text of the Bible, and in that case it would have been easy to answer it. But it is the Babel-like confusion of interpretation, shocking common sense, violating human instincts, contradicting fundamental principles of ethics and morals, and scandalizing men of sobriety with their extravagances, which has in these days given vitality to this question. It is the question of the day, and those who by their divisions have raised it, are directly responsible for the infidelity which has resulted, and the greater "falling away" which is yet to come.

In early times of Christianity, this conflict and confusion of exposition did not exist. Those who followed the "apostles' doctrine, and abode in their fellowship," listened to *positive* and harmonious teaching. The question they had to decide was simply not, What did the apostles say? Nor yet, What meaning are we to put upon what they said? But this: Do these apostles speak with the authority, and do they vindicate by their miraculous works, their claims to the inspiration of God? That was with them the question.

The answer to that question, the early converts had before their eyes, in the proofs the apostles gave them, at the time, of their superhuman power, and their supernatural knowledge. The foreknowledge they possessed, the languages they spoke without having studied them, the miracles they wrought, all betrayed the existence, in them, of powers so superhuman, that they must have been divine. Those who were united to the

apostles in fellowship, had one uniform doctrine taught them, and they believed it on the above grounds, and had not their minds disturbed by conflicting interpretations. But when "the acts of the apostles," and their doctrines and revelations were reduced to writing, these writings, or scriptures as we call them, would, of course, be liable to various interpretations; and the statements of one writer would, by captious and querulous persons, be put against those of another, and differences and variations would inevitably occur, if every man might put his own meaning upon the text of the Scriptures. To avoid this, "private" interpretations were forbidden them, just as private views of the law of the land would not be tolerated now, and any sense which violated the traditional meaning of Scripture was not recognized by the Church at large.

But then, again, as in the case with legal inquiries respecting the construction and sense of laws now, the traditional meaning of the Scriptures would at times be doubtful, or difficult to be discovered, and to meet this, the Lord Jesus Christ in his foresight ordained men, and gave them perpetual authority "to teach all things whatsoever He had commanded them," and they and their successors with whom Christ promised to be present until the end of the world, were invested with "authority in controversies of the faith," and they were to decide what was, or was not, the sense of the Scriptures.

If men had continued "steadfast in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship," no difficulties could have occurred, for all dangerous contingencies had thus been provided for in that fellowship. But men did not so continue, and now the endless variations in the interpretation of Scripture have driven some to question the inspiration of the Scriptures themselves. For, if they can succeed in destroying the impression that the Scriptures were inpired, they will feel little or no interest in determining the true sense; or they will take that to be the true meaning which most easily falls in with their own whims and feelings.

Wherever conflicting sects of professed and self-styled Christians are contending for what they suppose to be the true sense of Scripture, there, in that very place, or nation, the most active

mental preparation is going on for the open and undisguised denial of the inspiration of God's word.

While they are with heat and strife asserting this to be the sense of Scripture, and denying that, the calm observer steps in, and says: "I do not think that you believe yourselves in the inspiration of the Bible, whose meaning you are disputing about. If you did believe that God inspired the Bible, you never could suppose that God would allow the object He had in inspiring it, to be defeated, by leaving it to men 'unstable and unlearned' to put their private construction on it, and to wrest to their destruction what He meant for their salvation. If you did believe the Bible to be God's own Word, that belief would consecrate it in your eyes, and hinder you from finding, and proving, and splitting hairs, and quarrelling over it, like special pleaders, or less learned counsel. If you believed the Bible to be inspired, the real undoubted utterance of God, you would also believe, that, as in the case with human laws, the Divine Author of that code had established some authority, living and speaking on the earth, to determine its sense, maintain its integrity, free it from constructional contradictions, and enforce its precepts, and apply them to cases as they might arise."

And thus it is that the scandalous conflicts and contradictions of sectarian and heretical interpretation degrade God's word into a "bone of contention," and create an impression on the minds of thoughtful men, that the conflicting sects and parties do not themselves believe in the inspiration of what they contend about. And that this is true, may be proved from the fact well known, that the whole sectarian world outside the Church, is heaving and swelling in a great agony of mind respecting this question of inspiration.

Too late for retreat, they see the state of contemptuous indifference with which men begin to treat questions referring to the true or false interpretations of Scripture. They have brought it to pass that anything may be true or false, and that Scripture may be plausibly quoted to sustain any baseness or blasphemy. Too late to satisfy the demand, they see men asking for the authority, whose business it is to interpret and determine the sense of Scripture. An authority, which the course

of events convinces every man must have been appointed—an authority, however, which they have taught men to undervalue or despise. With those who respect the Church as the keeper and witness of holy writ, and as the divinely appointed power which has authority in controversies of faith, the answer to the question, "On what grounds do you assert the inspiration of the Scriptures?" is very plain. They assert the inspiration of the Scriptures upon the authority of the apostles; upon the authority of the men who wrote the Scriptures.

The man who writes a letter conveying information, has a right to specify the source from which he derived his information. The writers of the Scriptures assert their inspiration. This assertion is not unfounded or unsupported. Our Lord said that His apostles should be endued with power and knowledge from on high. And in their acts and sayings they gave evidence that they had received this endowment.

The proof of the inspiration of the Scriptures is to men in the Church not a mere speculative inference, or abstract argument. It is matter of evidence, proved by witnesses, and external testimony, and internal coherence, and consistency. We believe the Scriptures to be inspired because the Apostles said so, and because that assertion is verified by acts which God alone could have enabled them to perform, and that power God would not have given them if they were liars or deceivers.

But what is the nature of this inspiration? How far does it extend? Were they inspired as to facts or doctrines, as to principles or details, as to the words they used, or the substance of the thoughts they conveyed in words?

In the warfare which has arisen since private interpreters have started on their various voyages of discovery to take possession of certain parts of Scripture in their own name and for their own purposes, oceans of ink, and anger, and ignorant inaptitudes, have deluged the world. We cannot wade through waters, which, said to be derived from heavenly fountains, have sunk stinking and stagnant into a malarious morass, and proved by their unwholesomeness their earthly origin. We would fain leave the quagmire of contentious comment, and sectarian and heretical speculation, to those whose tastes, morals, and sensi-

bilities, are not offended by the profitless and unclean exploration.

But knowing the ingredients in that foul and seething swamp, a stern sense of duty requires us to specify a few, that the unwary may not be caught by any false light that plays upon its surface. The theory of a *verbal* inspiration must not be followed. No false light is more liable to mislead than this. The advocates of this theory profess to believe that the very words that were to be used by Scriptural writers, were suggested to the writer's mind by God; and that, in fact, God used the writer as a mere machine, and evoked certain sounds or words from him at will, as we evoke certain notes from an instrument or an organ when we touch the keys, after it has been inflated. It would be folly to suppose that the very words were suggested, for words are evanescent and treacherous; and if they were the results of inspiration, and if the very words were inspired, then no other words but the original ones could be regarded as revelation, and we should have no Bible; for a translation is not always a series of equivalents, and the mass of men have no knowledge of the original words.

There is no idolatry like that of the Book-worshippers, who, passing over the sense and spirit of revelation, checked and digested by the qualifications which the different Books supply, undertake to assert the inspiration of every word, and to idolize the letter, which is perishable and variable, instead of the uniform and well-considered meaning derived from it, which alone is invariable, and cannot fail.

At present, among idolators of the Bible, this absurdity of verbal inspiration extensively prevails. They are led to it by the necessity of their own position. They worship the Bible without note or comment, and make themselves its interpreters; they are therefore obliged, in order to procure acceptance for their follies or fancies, to allege the plenary and precise inspiration of every letter or word. They fix upon a word, and build a pile of speculation upon it, and claim inspiration for the word, that the reflex glory of the inspiration they suppose, may shine upon their own speculations. Very often, when you look at

the word in the original, there is no foundation for their folly, and you find their theory founded upon a figure of speech, or play upon words, which may be tolerated in the translation, but has no counterpart in the original, which alone they suppose to be inspired.

It is thus that a numerous sect have built up a theory about immersion, upon the supposition that Baptism must mean a plunging under, or immersion in the water; whereas, in the Greek Testament, we find that men are said to Baptize, or wash their hands, by having water poured upon them from a vessel by a by-stander. If we admit a verbal inspiration of the Greek text, we must then have inspired translators, who shall be divinely enabled to give the exact equivalents for every originally inspired Greek and Hebrew word. And as there have been many translations and different versions, we shall then require another inspiration of the man who is about to choose a Bible for himself, to enable him to select that version which faithfully represents the original text.

Thus do the supporters of this theory, to which they are driven by their own real, though unacknowledged want of an authority, competent and commissioned to translate and expound Scripture; thus such are driven into absurdity and folly, rather than admit that they want help which the Church was established and appointed to give "to unstable and unlearned inquirers" after truth.

The question with which we started, however, still recurs. What is meant by attributing inspiration to Scripture? And that question we can answer without embarrassment, puzzling and confounding as it is to all those who stand outside the Catholic and Apostolic Church.

While the Church rejects the idea of an inspiration attaching to words and phrases, which are only vehicles of the truth, conveying ideas to us, and valueless in themselves, as a husk, or shell, or algebraic sign, she asserts, that the spiritual truths and doctrines enunciated in Scripture are of divine origin, and that they were suggested or revealed to the evangelical and apostolical writers of the Scriptures by the Spirit of God.

This revelation of the substance of Scriptural truth, as for instance, the incarnation, which may be called the central mystery, is the fountain from which all other truth proceeds. The first principles of the doctrine of Christ, Baptism, faith, repentance, laying on of hands, the resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment, these must have been revealed to Saint Paul by a sensible miracle, which would prevent him from confounding them with the conclusions of his own mind.

When the disciples felt that peculiar sensation which they describe as their hearts "burning within them" on the way to Emmaus, and when Saint Paul heard, while prostrated on the road to Damascus, a voice pleading with him and commanding him what to do, this sensation and this voice were to them indubitable proofs of God's presence with them. It is credible that they never could mistake any other sensation, or any other voice for the true one. The occurrence of this sensation, or the sounding of that awful voice again, in Saint Paul's inner or outer ear, would be, after our Lord's ascension, still a proof of the Divine presence; and the thoughts then suggested, would be as unmistakably a revelation, as that opening of the Scripture, and those directions to Saint Paul, which accompanied their first experience of them by the Apostles.

We do not pretend to say, that this is the way the writers of the Scriptures were inspired; but, we assert, in this way, by the recurrence of these well-remembered, and once sensibly miraculous visitations, they might be enabled to distinguish the thoughts with which God inspired them, from the conclusions of their own minds, without error or admixture of human wisdom.

But being inspired as to the substance of principal truths, they each retained their own manner of expression, and the peculiarities which mark and individualize their several styles. And it is a high mark of the wisdom which gave us the revelation, that we are not left to one form of expression, nor one peculiarity of style in their enunciation. The different sets of words in which we have "the first principles of the doctrine of Christ" announced to us, enable us to take the kernel of the sense out of the husk of the words; and if we find that kernel

a little shapeless or imperfect in Saint Paul's revelation of it, Saint James or Saint John, or Saint Peter, will, in their specimens of the fruit of the tree of divine knowledge, supply us with the true form, or correct, or indicate the deficiency. We do not care, what series of ideas are introduced into the minds of a given number of men, if they have been previously unfamiliar with them, and have received them under various circumstances, they will report of them differently. The series of new and unfamiliar ideas introduced by inspiration into the minds of men like the Apostles, would share the same fate when they came to record them. Any one who wished to discover what had been introduced would carefully compare their reports, and correcting, one by the other, and the third by both, would arrive at a full and comprehensive understanding of the ideas that had been originally presented.

And this is what it is the Church's business to do, with the revelations and principles of Christian doctrine made to the evangelists and Apostles. The wisdom of God is manifold, and it was revealed to the Apostles in a manifold way. The records of apostolic inspiration are to be searched, the individual views combined and harmonized, and then through the agency of preaching and catechizing, the manifold wisdom of God is to be made known by the Church to the world. This search, and this comparison of spiritual things with spiritual, is to be made by the authorities of the Church, who are commanded to teach and preach all things, that Christ commanded them, in order that they may be enabled to put together for the "unstable and unlearned" the *disjecta membra*, the scattered members of the body of sound words and doctrine, and so be able to teach them without omissions or contradictions.

And another search is permitted to those who hear and learn. But it is a search limited to the privilege of seeing whether these things are so. That kind of search which made the Bereans noble, in Saint Paul's estimation and report of them. Men who have many prejudices, and many preconceived notions derived from authors of various heresies and divisions, go to Scripture with them, and are displeased with any teacher who tells them

that Scripture, rightly interpreted, does not sanction them. In this they err. If they spent their time prayerfully and teachably in learning the one, ancient, traditional, invariable and true system, which the Apostles were commanded to teach, and did teach, they might then go to Scripture with it with pleasure and advantage, and find that, indeed, these things were so. There can be absolutely and positively but one true system, that cannot be discovered tuitatively without tremendous risk, if so discoverable at all. It must be received humbly from its guardian and depository, the Church, which is "the pillar and ground of the truth." Every such search that is made, will display the wonderful conformity of the Church's system of truth, to all parts of holy Scripture.

The evil results of Bibliolatry, and presumptuous, private interpretation, are seen in the terrible reaction against the Bible, which is rising among those who have been disgusted by the perversions and follies of private and sectarian interpreters, who, by presenting the Bible as an object of worship, are provoking an assault against the inspiration of that Blessed Book. The value of this worship of the Bible may be tested, however, in a very simple way, by referring to the text just quoted.

We hear a great deal about the duty of obedience to the precepts of Scripture, and the obligation to search the Oracles of God for uncorrupted truth. Some of this is sincere; more of this idolatry of the Bible is mistaken; still more is the *cant* of the day, which men, "who care for none of these things," fall into, because it is popular.

Take it all as real, let us test the worth of this professed respect for the Bible. Men worship the Bible as the word of truth, each man consults it as an oracle, and *puts his own construction on its responses.* The Bible itself, when asked, What is truth? says, the "Church is the pillar and ground of the truth." Do those who worship the Bible, believe the Bible, when it testifies against itself in favor of the Church as the rest and support of Divine Revelation? Or do they think the truth which the living God left to the Church, can live where there are only endless contradictions?

The Scriptures, therefore, given by inspiration of God, can be profitable for "doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," mainly and chiefly only, when its rules and meaning have been systematized and reduced to such order and harmony, as will permit their ready application to cases where the man of God stands at the intersection of conflicting texts, or opposing rules or laws of action, looking not for the weight of testimony, or the balance of probabilities, but for the decisions of that authority, which disperses doubts about our destination, and will not leave faith to fail, saying: "This is the way, walk ye in it."

Men, misled by a mere metaphor, speak of the Scriptures as a chart. So they are to every one who understands their uses. But even a good seaman, when in a dangerous passage, is willing to give up his chart for a competent pilot. When any man has the principles of the doctrine of Christ, gathered out of Scripture, and arranged in an orderly and harmonious manner, in his mind, then he has a view of doctrine and duty, and taking the teachings of the Church as his pilot, he can guide his course with discretion.

But if he despises the authority which was left to teach what Christ commanded, and undertakes to make his own digest of the laws and principles he is to walk by, we may be sure that he will not be thoroughly furnished unto all good works. That he will most certainly need the correction, the reproof, the instruction in righteousness, which the Scriptures are profitable for, when rightly and fully understood.

The man who thus sets up as a private interpreter of Scripture, and despises the authority, which is the pillar and ground of the truth, will eventually experience the fate of the man, who, in undertaking to act as his own lawyer, found that he had a fool for a client.

Hence the vital import of a Creed, or symbol of faith. The Heidelberg Catechism, based as it is upon the teachings of the Holy Catholic Church, is a sure and safe pilot. Its interpretation of Scripture comes to us as the voice of the Church. More than any other uninspired work, it contains the very essence of

the Holy Scriptures. It has a vitality and power almost divine. In it, the Reformed Church has a heritage of priceless value. The mind stored with its precious truths need not err, because thereby we know the Scriptures, and the power of God.

ART. VI.—THE SATANIC BACK-GROUND IN REDEMPTION.

BY REV. SAMUEL H. GIESY, A.M., PHILADELPHIA.

Satan is no myth. Neither our faith nor our fears are directed to unrealities. Faith is the soul's repose on the great verities centering in an actualized Redemption from the power which originally brought in the curse. Fear is the soul's full realization of that impersonated antagonism working its destruction, to be opposed and resisted. The spirit of negation, seeking to exalt itself above all that is called God—the great Anti-Deus, and the recognized Anti-Christ of post-Christianity—is not a figment of the imagination, airy nothingness, but the dark background both of the sacred Scriptures, and the great deliverance they reveal. The very form of the Scriptures is ruled by this pre-historic fact, in which Redemption finds its deep necessity.

The doctrine of the Devil is not incorporated as an article in the Christian Creed. Certainly not. It is the dogma lying back of, and necessitating the dogma of the "Son of God." Faith is the realm, not of unrest and resistance, but true repose. The soul reposes in its Saviour, and the grace which bringeth salvation, not in its antagonist, and the work which bringeth damnation. Satan is a disturbing, disorganizing, demoralizing activity, self-opposed to God, and seeking to put every thing beside in opposition to Him. To be believed in is he; not, however, in the sense of quiet surrender to his deceiving and destructive will, but a tremendous reality to be warred against, and from whose power deliverance is to be earnestly desired and sought. Because the dark power over against which Redemption is set, the dogma of Satan finds no place in the Creed.

His kingdom is that organic power of evil, against which the Creed itself is a solemn protest and self-committal.

There seems to be a frivolous prejudice, if, indeed, it be nothing worse, against all avowal of belief in the Devil. The virus of Rationalism has been working insidiously here against the true and ancient faith. The following extract from a religious paper, will show how this Rationalistic spirit, across the waters, has been lifting itself up against Church order and faith:

"The Kingdom of Hanover, ecclesiastically, holds the Lutheran faith. Its cultus having been impregnated with a Rationalistic element, some of the leading divines of the State Church were instructed by the authorities to prepare a new Liturgy, which should harmonize better with orthodox Lutheranism. But a large part of the people, retaining the leaven of a laxer faith, strenuously resist its introduction. As a consequence, the Church of Hanover has been thrown into a violent fermentation. The *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung* of Berlin, gives the following as an instance connected with this opposition. In Hoya, Hanover, a tailor, named Kole, wanted to have his children baptized on New Year's day. The officiating minister proceeded without interruption, until he propounded the question about a personal Devil. Instead of answering in the affirmative, the father declared that he knew nothing of a personal Devil, and wanted his children to be baptized without the avowal of his belief in this article. The baptismal ceremony came to a stand-still. The minister took the man into a private chamber, and tried to reason with him, but without success. He took his children home unbaptized. The fathers of several other families, having children to baptize, requested the minister to administer baptism without this question, stating that if he refused they would address a remonstrance to the Superior Council (Ober-Kirchenrath); and if that would prove ineffectual, that they would have their children baptized in a Reformed Church in Bremen."

It is not at all likely that these Rationalistic parents succeeded any better in the Reformed Church of Bremen. There would

scarcely be any abatement in a genuinely Reformed Church of the old demand of formally "renouncing the Devil and his works," as coming up in the Baptismal service. Not to that quarter of the globe is this dangerous heresy confined. If so, we might let the Germans fight their own battles. But it has crept into the theological thought and literature of our own land.

Following the universal faith of the Church, as expressed in the earliest Liturgies, and incorporated into those of the Reformation period, this old question, touching the renunciation of the Devil, has been retained most properly in the Baptismal and Confirmation forms of the Provisional, and likewise the Revised Liturgy. Apprehending the terrific fact of sin under its true Scriptural representation—the outworking of Satanic opposition to God and good—the Reformed Church could not be true to Christianity, and break, at this point, with the truth of all ages. It apprehends an organic power of evil lying back of the redemption in Christ, and from which deliverance is thereby to be effected, and so authoritatively teaches.

The doctrine of grace necessarily takes its complexion from the doctrine of sin. If evil, in its Satanic personification, is a myth, then redemption, in its divine-human embodiment, must also be a myth. "But if it be an organized empire, with a personal head—a power, wise, wily, and deceitful, not only inherent in the fallen human heart, but swaying a dominant sceptre over the affairs of the world, nothing short of a personal divine Redeemer can deliver us." There can be no proper faith in the Redemption itself, where there is not full belief in the personal presence and activity of the Devil, by this very work in a personal Saviour overwhelmed.* Luther was not wrong in making belief in Satan a test of soundness in a Christian teacher. His direct question in such cases was, "Does he be-

* "As there is [in the Pelagian anthropological view just held up to censure] no organic power of the Devil or kingdom of darkness, for men to be delivered from, so there will be no organic redemption either, no objective historical order of grace, in the bosom and through the power of which this salvation is to go forward." J. W. Nevin, D.D., Theo. Vindication of the New Liturgy, p. 86.

lieve in the Devil?" He was perfectly right in going on the assumption, that no man believed in Christ, who did not believe in a personal Devil, and was wholly unfit for the office of a Christian teacher in any position. How strong was his own faith in this direction, and how earnestly he contended with the powers of darkness, was evinced in the well known incident in the castle of Wartburg. It was strong faith that so aroused that heroic spirit. However it may be with others, we have never been able to laugh at his flinging his inkstand at the head of the Arch-destroyer.

The Scriptures uniformly represent this antagonism of evil under the form of an infernal embodiment. Names stand for realities. They represent entities. They do mean something. The representations of the Bible, through its manifold and age-long revelations, are significantly one here. It puts Satan before us, always and everywhere, not as an evil influence merely, but as "*the evil one;*" not ἡ πονηρια—a perverse and wicked disposition, but ὁ πονηρος—the wicked one,—the spirit of negation opposing itself to God. The ground-work of the fall was no bad disposition, no principle of evil simply in man. The Scriptural account sets it forth as the work of a Titanic power outside of and distinct from man. The fall itself never would have been possible, except for this external power of evil, insidiously creeping upon him, and working his moral overthrow. This is the very dogma of Original Sin—the Devil springing in upon our nature, the dominion of a foreign and destructive power. The proof of this lies in the temptation itself. Hence Eve's confession: "The *serpent beguiled me*, and I did eat." St. Paul pronounces the same judgment in the case: "The *serpent beguiled Eve* through his subtilty." (2 Cor. xi. 3.) True to this Scriptural deliverance, the Heidelberg Catechism declares it to have come in "by the instigation of the Devil."

Nor is the temptation of the second Adam to be resolved into any such internal conflict with self-suggested thoughts of self-indulgence, vain-glory, and ambition. If it be utterly inconceivable with the character and position of the first, that he should have been his own tempter, how much more even should

this be the case with the second Adam! Standing in the sphere, not of our fallen, but normal humanity, the temptation of the second Adam in the wilderness, as of the first Adam in the garden, must have come, not from within, but from without. Archbishop Trench, in a work recently published, "Studies in the Gospels," says: "We cannot conceive of the temptation of the first Adam reaching him except from without. That he should have been his own tempter, is irreconcilable even with the mere negative holiness which we ascribe to him. It would have been infinitely more inconsistent with the more positive holiness of the second Adam." In its triple, and each time more intensified form, it was evidently, not from a disposition of an evil character within, but a power, seeking the overthrow of the second, as of the first and fallen Adam. Utterly inconsistent with this Biblical view, is this false idea, so currently and so dogmatically asserted, that the only Devil there is in the world is the Devil which every man carries in his own breast. Was the Devil, who assailed our Lord so unsuccessfully in the wilderness, simply evil, under this impersonal form? How, then, is that terrific conflict reduced to a mere scenic display—a sort of sham fight!

But giving Satan such terrific personality even, could Christ have been overthrown? This is as much as asking: Was the temptation itself a reality or a sham? There can be no temptation where there is no peccability. Absolute holiness is proof against evil, and thus beyond the power of being tempted. Christ was not absolute Deity, but God standing under the conditions, limitations, and weaknesses of humanity. The impossibility of sinning, the scholastic expression for which was, "Non *posse* peccare"—this attribute of untemptable and untrembling holiness—belongs to God alone. The possibility of not sinning, the "posse *non* peccare" of the Schoolmen, and which is only the negative form of putting the matter—the possibility of failure in the exercise of moral freedom—belonged to man in his normal state, fresh sprung from his Creator's hand. It was a privative condition of his being. Self-determination *may be* a determination in the wrong direction. Wherever there

is a human will, there is and must be the possibility of its wrong, as well as right exercise. Christ was thoroughly human: a factor in the wonderful constitution of His Person, not to be lost sight of for a single moment. The temptability of Christ grew out of His peccability; His peccability out of the realness of the human side of His being. "What is less than infinite is temptable and peccable; Christ's humanity was less than infinite, therefore His humanity might have been overthrown." This tremendous possibility, in-midst the most potent and repeated temptations, never became an actuality. And here already, in the very sphere of our moral and spiritual life, was Christ's first and continuous victory over Satan achieved, long before it was ultimately completed in the sphere of the physical life, of which, however, it was a prophecy and sure pledge. This view of the matter is presented by Dr. Ullmann, in his "Sinlessness of Jesus," where the thought is so clearly and learnedly brought out, that Christ's sinlessness was not a negative quality simply as to sin, but a positive and demonstrated character in that direction—an actualized power against sin and over sin under the terrible pressure of the personal Tempter, the sorest and most real temptations, and the fearful possibility of a different issue altogether. And that these earlier conflicts with Satan in the sphere of the human will were terrific realities, is evident from the fact that at no time does He fall back upon His reserved attributes of Divinity, but opposes to them only the same moral activity and spiritual helps, which we do ourselves possess. Thus, and thus only, does the result of the temptation in our Victorious Headship become so significant, and the power of hope to us, and not despair.

Evil is not an impersonal principle merely, but has a personal head, and is an organized power in the world as now constituted; and, if ever overthrown, must be overthrown in this headship. Take the names by which Satan is spoken of in the Bible; and it is utterly impossible to conceive of him as an evil principle simply, much less a mythical character. The names embody too much of a terrific reality for anything of that kind. They hold up to the terrified imagination nothing

of a fanciful and fictitious character. They show him up as the fearful embodiment of all antagonism to God—*ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου* of St. John's Gospel; *ὁ ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος* of St. Paul; also his *ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους*; also the *τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου* of Hebrews ii. 14. They give him personal names; ascribe to him personal attributes, and steadily speak of him under a personal form.*

Every kingdom has its headship. The power is enthroned in the acknowledged chieftain. The whole power of the Russian empire is invested in the Czar. He wields immense authority; is a mighty potentate; moves subordinate powers all over his vast kingdom. The kingdom of darkness has its headship. It has its "principalities and powers," too, obeying the great leader's voice, to whom the titular dignity of embodied authority is given. He is called, as we have seen, in one place, "the Prince of this world," setting forth both the personality of his evil character, and the sphere of his evil operations; "the Prince of the power of the air," indicating his control even of outward nature, making it do his malignant behests; "the god of this world," "the ruler of darkness," "the power of death," indicating the mastery of God, the overthrow of truth, the establishment of misrule, the complete domination of sin and death, to be his infernal and inveterate purpose; "the man of sin," pointing to his use of a now disordered and perverted moral nature to bring the whole human world under his usurpation, by intensifying opposition, lifting man up against his Creator and God, whose will alone he ought to obey; "principalities and powers," designating the diversity and multiplicity of the diabolizing agencies under his authority and direction.

In the use of these and kindred names, the Scriptures put the personality and activity of Satan before us as a terrific reality. The dark back-ground of Redemption is sin and guilt; the back-ground of sin is Satan. Its end is deliverance from the power of the Devil—the breaking of this yoke of bondage.

---

* "The Devil is not merely evil in this or that particular relation; it is evil in and for itself, the evil spirit as such. The Devil is not merely one evil creation, not one demon among many, but the evil principle itself *in persona*." Martensen's Christian Dogmatics, p. 90; Clark's translation.

The sceptre must be wrested from this Prince of darkness. This usurping lord must be conquered in his own dominions. This spoiler must be "spoiled" by the Stronger, and an open show of this triumph made.

This embodiment of Satanic malice and mischief must be met by a counter embodiment of the delivering Power. A personal Devil requires a personal Deliverer. This necessity was met in the Incarnation of the Son of God. It could not have been met in any other way. The case needed such an intervention—an actual linking of the powers of God to the broken and disordered powers of humanity, because the evil which wrought its ruin stands forth in such a real, malignant headship. The kingdom of grace, with its mighty Headship in Christ, is only to be apprehended itself a grand reality, as it is thus conceived to be antagonizing and contesting this world's possession, not with evil in a vague, general, and, more or less, ideal, but personal and enthroned form.

The spoiling process must take place in the very sphere of being and activity, where Satan wrought his work of ruin. Human nature and a thorough human life must be the theatre of this momentous conflict. From the beginning of the race, human life has been the sphere of Satan's activity.

The vast endowment of intelligence and will carries with it the tremendous prerogative and responsibility of self-determination. Satan stood originally in such a relation to his Creator. His will was not created evil; but, in its wrong and independent action, he made it evil. He determined himself in this wrong and independent exercise of his intelligence and will against God. But his sinful activity stayed not with setting himself at variance with God. Wherever there is a created will, he seeks to turn it into the same channel of independence and opposition.

No sooner is man created, than we find Satan obtruding his presence and activity. The Divine ideal in man's creation was his complete realization of the law of holy obedience as the law of his true destiny. The very conditions of such an experiment must be intelligence and will—the capacity of judgment and the power of self-determination. It could not possibly hold

under any other form. These attributes, with the correlative danger, their wrong exercise, held in the original constitution of man. He was made in the image of God. By this we are to understand the actual endowment of that intelligence and will, entering as constituent and indispensable elements into the full establishment or fearful loss of moral freedom. The will as a self-determining thing beyond or outside of God, is the greatest and highest of all creations—nearest like God Himself —a kind of microcosm of God, concentering in itself the image of God.

The terrific possibility of failure inheres in every created will. Satan, in his self-perverted and perverting activity, determines in man's case to make it a mournful actuality. Self-opposed, he will seek to bring this highest of God's creatures into alike antagonism with God. To lift him up to this dizzy height of formally declaring his independence of God only to plunge him into the frightful abyss of sin and misery below, Satan appeals both to the consciousness and gain of such self-activity. "For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."

The moment was a critical one. The destiny of a human world trembled in the balance. The most tremendous issues were involved. In the sphere of human life and the elevated range of intelligence and evil, the conflict was for Divine or Satanic mastery. The sad result is before us. Man was "spoiled" of his high moral qualities. They do, indeed, remain, but always under a perverted and perverting form. Under the deceptive pretence of becoming more free and independent, man has become, in his whole activity, more slavish and bound. His fall has rivetted upon him the laws of sin and death. He has put himself under the power of a will disordering and demonizing. His liberty has been swept away. Another lords it over him. Led captive at the will of this tyrant-master, the activities of his life are ever self-destructive. Every movement tends to wider separation from God and wilder discord, in the more fearful enthronement of the powers of evil.

How now shall this spoiler of man's priceless "goods" be himself, like a vanquished army, stripped of his spoils? How shall this master-spirit of all wickedness, who succeeded in thus springing the laws of sin over all the activities of our being, be defeated in his destructive aims? How shall we be delivered from the power of the Devil?

It is very clear that the sphere of any such conflict, answering the ends in view, must take place in the very sphere of the original disaster and defeat. The mastery of Satan over humanity is to be contested again in the sphere of humanity. The victory must be achieved where the sin and fall had been effected, in the form of veritable manhood. Our Champion-hero must be in the "likeness of men." Our Deliverer must be man. It was in the sphere of the flesh that the defeat took place; in the sphere of the flesh must victory be won. The conflict could not be carried forward in any other order of beings. Hence it is said, Christ "took not on Him the nature of angels; but He took on Him the seed of Abraham." Actual humanity must again be matched against Satanic malice and power.

As the crown and consummation of the whole work of creation, the Incarnation would have taken place even if man had not sinned. We cannot say that the fact of sin created the necessity for the Incarnation. That would be to conceive of the whole work of Redemption as an afterthought with God—something unawares sprung in to head off Satan. Whereas the fact of sin only determined the actual and attendant circumstances of that Incarnation.

Redemption must be carried forward victoriously to its last end. The last power of Satan must be destroyed. Suffering and death inhere in sin. Its fearful penalty was, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The answering echo to this, we have in St. Paul's pregnant expression, "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Suffering and death, therefore, were not incidents in the work of Redemption, but its absolute condition—the very form which it must take. Sin had sprung the laws of death in upon our

human life. Because of sin, humanity is suffering, dying humanity. Death reigns from Adam onward. The head sinned and died, and the members in the head.

Placing Himself in the sphere, Christ places Himself under this dreadful necessity, of humanity. There is no outlet for Him, as there is none for us. There is no escape for Him from the grave, as there is none for us. He must die, as we must. It is sin's bitter curse—its terrible power. Our complete deliverance requires the breaking of this power. This is only possible by our Lord Himself coming temporarily under its power—stooping to conquer.

The Cross was a dark necessity in the way of human redemption. It was the only method by which Satanic "principalities and powers" could be vanquished, and, as the vanquished, made to give back the dominion they had usurped in the sphere of our human life. Our Deliverer must Himself die, because He entered really into the lot of our human life, and, that dying, He might exhaust the penalty and live again, and, living again, declare Himself in the fulness of His glorious triumph, "The Resurrection and the Life." There was no other way for His entrance into His mediatorial glory. To the despondent disciples, so slow to apprehend the bitter reality, He put this question: "*Ought not* Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?"

There was no other way for us to follow Him into His glory. Death must be conquered in Him for us. "The last enemy is death." All other successes in the sphere of redemption on His part would have been vitiated, had not this last enemy been destroyed. The very weapons of Satan are turned against him.

Though the Cross was in the full sense a sacrificial death, yet was it not the grand finish to the work of atonement. Had the work ended there, it would have ended sadly both for Christ and us—ended darkly. Had the Gospel ended with these words of St. Matthew, touching the anxiety and precaution of the Jews after the crucifixion. "Pilate said unto them, ye have a watch: go your way, make it as sure as ye can: so they went, and

made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch;" had the event, recorded in the last chapter of the synoptical Gospels, and the last two chapters of St. John's Gospel, not transpired, where should our deliverance from the power of the Devil be? It is everything to us to know, that having really bowed His sacred head in death, He stretched forth the nerves of His Almightiness, snapped asunder the bands of death, and with His rising lifted up our death-ridden humanity from the gloomy prison-house into which Satan by sin had thrust it. This victory over sin and death, beginning with the Incarnation and completed in the Resurrection and Ascension, constituting the "obedience even unto death" of a righteous and sinless life in midst of the actual conditions of humanity itself, forms man's deliverance from the power of the devil.

Hence the significance of the glorious fact of our Lord's Resurrection. Here there was an actual dragging forth of hellish forces, when on His triumphal car, the Prince of Life passed out through the opened gate-way of death. "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain; ye are yet in *your sins*"—under the power still of an unbroken curse. Christianity is itself then an immense lie, and the whole movement of God to our deliverance from the power of the Devil an egregious blunder. But not so. "Having spoiled principalities and powers, He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it." In this view of the case, a profound meaning belongs to these words of St. Paul.

This Satanic overthrow, however, did not, and could not end with this glorious achievement in the Headship of grace. Though wielding a shattered sceptre, the powers of darkness are still operating in the world. The fruits of the resurrection—victory, are to be reaped in the progress of history, only by this work of redemption being made a perpetual fact and power in the constitution of our fallen world. How was this otherwise possible, but under the form of an historical continuance of the redemption itself? Hence the Ascension of Christ, followed by the promised descent of the Holy Ghost and the establishment of the Christian Church.

The procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the ascended Son, constituted the Christian Church, the historical form under which this power from God, antagonizing and destined eventually to subvert the kingdom of evil, finds both actual embodiment and efficient operation. The miracle of Pentecost—the birth-day of the Church—was the full enthronement in the history of the world of this antagonistic kingdom of grace, carrying over thus, in a permanent and perpetual form for all time, the power of redemption as originally comprehended in the Person of that victorious and ever-living Head. In the sphere of our abnormal human life and history, Satanic agencies are still working ruin and death. In the same sphere, and under the form of this Divine organization, stands forth the contesting, militating and subduing power from God. Here we find incessant war authoritatively made on the kingdom of Satan. This must be so unless the work of redemption itself is to prove a failure. Here we find the presence and activity of grace over against the presence and activity of sin projected into the very constitution of the world, and perpetuated through the ages. It is the Divine form which has been given to our deliverance from the power of the Devil, and the very order of supernatural grace in which the eventual overthrow of his empire holds. There can be no deliverance on the outside. On the outside is the reign of terror. The Church is the abode and home of the Spirit, and thus the sphere of the operations of Divine grace and deliverance.

It has, as had He who is its living Head, a Divine mission in the world. Did He come as St. John emphatically tells us, "to destroy the works of the Devil" (1 John iii. 8)? The perpetual fulfilment of this purpose is the mission of the Church. It is a militant power on the earth, militating against and laboring to overthrow the kingdom of evil at every point. It must meet all hostile elements, and overwhelm them with utter confusion and defeat. As much is comprehended in the common designation, "the militant Church," the Church under the leadership of its victorious Captain, marching through all Satanic opposition, along the centuries, to ultimate and complete

triumph. As much, too, is involved in the idea and promise carried along from age to age, in the designation of the Church of the future, "the Church Triumphant." What is this but the promise, borne along in the struggles of the Church, that Christ shall put all enemies under His feet, though "now we see not yet all things put under Him."

The head of the Serpent must be bruised and broken wherever it is lifted up. In its age-long mission, this is what the Church has been doing, thus actualizing the deep purpose of our Lord's Incarnation—the Serpent-Bruiser of the earliest promise. Within and without its pale, the mystery of iniquity has been wont to show itself—heresy within, and the antagonism of worldly powers without. The history of the Church is the dark record of these conflicts with internal and external foes—*bella cum hæreticis.* Who is prepared to say that in this terrific conflict with the powers of darkness, the history of the last *eighteen centuries* has proved a grand farce, a magnificent sham? Nay, on each side mighty powers are matched—the kingdom of Christ over against the kingdom of Satan.

Personal identification with the Church is the solemn committal of one's self, and those represented in the act, against the empire of Satan. It is throwing off the yoke of a usurper, and taking vows of allegiance to the rightful Sovereign. It is proper, nay, imperative, that this declaration of determined hostility to Satan should be formally announced in the initial Sacrament of the Church. Baptism into Christ is the sacramental transfer into the kingdom of grace, and, in that sense and to that extent, deliverance from the Devil. Hence, properly does the question stand in the Baptismal form: "Dost thou renounce the Devil with all his ways and works?" It would be anti-Christian in its spirit and form, if this were not prominently and distinctly incorporated in it.

Baptism looks forward always to the complimental act of Confirmation. When the child attains full age, it is expected that those representative vows will be personally and voluntarily assumed. Their personal assumption commits all such, by their own free act, to all that was implied in the original transaction.

Hence, most properly this question, in the same form exactly, is repeated to the candidate for Confirmation. The Liturgy would be Pelagian in its teachings were it omitted in either case.

ART. VII.—ARIANISM.

BY J. W. NEVIN, D.D., PRESIDENT OF FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA.

A heresy of the Fourth Century, which, by denying the proper Divinity of Christ, struck at the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and for a time threatened to overthrow the foundations of the Christian faith; although in the end it served only to bring out clearly the true sense of this doctrine as it had been previously involved in the consciousness of the Church, and caused it to become thus the corner-stone of all positive Catholic theology in subsequent ages. It derives its name from Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria, who was the immediate occasion of its breaking out at this place, and afterwards spreading into the East; but its real cause and origin are to be sought in the theological life of the Christian world, as it then stood, under a deeper and far more comprehensive view. The Christian consciousness had very soon come to an apprehension of the Divine nature of Christ; there was no difficulty felt in declaring Him to be God, without qualification or reserve. Then came, however, the question of his hypostatical independence, the relation which his higher nature was to be regarded as holding to the absolute being of God. Sabellianism, at first view, seemed to make the greatest possible account of Christ's Divinity, by destroying all distinction between it and the being of God universally considered. It saw in Him an incarnation, not of any secondary or derived Divine existence, but of the absolute God himself. To the Christian consciousness, however, this was felt to involve a relapse into Ebionitism, which made the Divine in Christ to be a mere outside qualification of His human person, and overthrew the significance of it entirely for the pur-

poses of the world's redemption. It became thus a reigning object, with the third century particularly, to assert, over against this false tendency, the real *personality* of Christ's higher nature; the hypostatic difference of the Son from the Father; and in the prosecution of this purpose, it may be admitted, less stress was laid at times than before, on the assertion of their common Divinity. In these circumstances it became the great problem of the fourth century, to bring into harmonious doctrinal union here the two sides of the truth in regard to Christ's Divine nature, which had been asserted previously only in a separate way, and one always more or less at the cost of the other; while both were felt, at the same time, to be grounded with equal certainty in the Christian faith itself. The solution of the problem lay, of course, between Sabellianism on the one hand, and such a subordination of the Son to the Father on the other hand, as might amount to an exclusion of the first from the Godhead altogether. The Arian controversy represents to us the process through which the mighty movement, big with the interests of Christianity for all following time, was carried forward to its proper completion.

The rise of Arianism was favored by the prevalence of the theological view, which, in the Eastern Church especially, had come to look upon the Divinity of the Son as holding, in one form or another, a certain subordination, in the constitution of the Trinity, to the Divinity of the Father. Those who had this view, joined with it generally an explicit acknowledgment of His being God in the proper sense of the term; they only thought it necessary to maintain in this way the idea of His full personal distinction from the Father. But in opposition to this there was now developed an anti-subordination tendency also, as it may be called, which saw in this view of Christ's distinction from the Father, peril only to the idea of His equality with the Father, and which was ready, therefore, to set its face vigorously against all such thinking, wherever it might come in its way.

A strenuous representative of this feeling we have in the person of Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt; under whom

the presbyter, Arius, is first introduced to our notice. A long, lean, pale, earnest-looking man, we are told, with a thick head of hair, not kept in the best order; a man of rather pleasing address, and as it would seem, of somewhat various learning, although his knowledge was more superficial than deep. He is represented also as being something of a poet; but this can have been only in a very outward mechanical way; his nature certainly was not of the poetical sort. A Lybian by birth, he yet owed his theological training to the East; more particularly it appears to Lucian of Antioch, whose subordination views he adopted, and tried to introduce subsequently at Alexandria. Here, however, the opposite way of thinking was now predominant, although there was still great fear also of Sabellianism. After Alexander became bishop, it soon appeared that the two men stood seriously apart in their theological opinions with regard to this great subject. The difference came out fully in a diocesan convention held by the bishop, in which he took occasion, with reference no doubt to the questionable teaching of Arius, to set forth his own doctrine of the Trinity, insisting particularly on the necessity of maintaining the Divine nature in the distinction of the Divine persons. Arius hereupon accused Alexander of holding the heresy of Sabellius, and argued from the idea of generation that there was a time when the Son was not (ἦν, ὁτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ υἱος). He denied thus that he was eternal in the same sense with the Father, and maintained likewise that his generation did not flow necessarily from the being of God, (which would involve, he thought, a Sabellian consequence,) but was to be regarded as flowing in a free way from God's will. The production of the Son in this way he held to be out of nothing (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων), and not out of God, while he placed him at the same time above all creatures, represented him to be without change, and gave him an intermediate position between God and the world, making him to be, through the indwelling fulness of God, the fountain of the whole creation in every lower view. These latter points, however, borrowed from the Christian thinking of the time, he found himself forced afterwards to give up, as not agreeing logically with his main posi-

tion. In denying to the Son all participation in the actual being of God, he could attribute to him only a time existence, in virtue of which, then, it was necessary to conceive of him as subject to change (*τρεπτὸς καὶ ἀλλοιωτὸς τὴν φύσιν, ὡς καὶ πάντα τὰ λογικά*), as imperfect in knowledge, and as capable even of falling into sin.

The convention gave judgment against Arius, but this did not end the controversy. He had his party, and spared no pains to strengthen it. Alexander wrote against him in vain; there was danger of a schism in the Church. Finally, a council was called, consisting of about one hundred bishops, which excommunicated him and all his adherents (a. 321). He now left Egypt, and betook himself to the East, where he had reason to expect his views would meet with more favor. Letters were addressed by him to the Oriental bishops, especially to Eusebius of Nicomedia, bespeaking their sympathy, and assuring them that they themselves had been condemned along with him in Egypt. Alexander, at the same time, sent a circular to the Eastern Church, giving information of what had been done in his case. Arius went first to Palestine, and afterwards to Nicomedia, finding every where more kindly reception than he had met with in Egypt. Here he wrote his Thalia, a few fragments of which have been preserved, and also some songs, designed to guard his doctrine among the people. Eusebius tried to bring about a reconciliation between him and his bishop; the question was not so important, he thought, but that a little yielding on both sides might make room for its satisfactory settlement. The Asiatic bishops generally looked at the matter in the same way, and used their influence, on different occasions, to have Arius restored to his office. Their reigning view of the doctrine of the Trinity at this time, has its best representative perhaps in Eusebius of Cesarea. He occupied in the main the Origenistic standpoint, insisted on the subordination of the Son to the Father, made the generation of the Son to be an act of God's will, and held it to be in this view before all time, but not strictly eternal. He did not like, indeed, the proposition of Arius: "There was a time when the Son was not;" and shrank

generally from his way of sundering Him who is called the express image of the Father from the Father Himself. Still for his thinking the idea of the Godhead was complete in the Father—and it appeared to him Sabellian error to suppose that the Father might pass over His own proper being to the Son. From this standpoint he sought to restore peace between Alexander and Arius. Relying on the good offices of his Eastern friends, Arius himself seems now also to have returned again to Alexandria. But there was no reconciliation. The controversy went forward in Egypt as before.

In the meantime, the Emperor Constantine had it in his mind to make a visit to that country; but hearing of the theological commotions which were at work there, he considered it prudent to have them out of the way before he undertook the journey, and for this purpose sent his court bishop, Hosius, in advance, with a letter to Alexander and Arius, exhorting them to become reconciled. In this letter, reflecting of course the judgment of the Asiatic bishops, he treats the subject of their quarrel as one of very little importance, and sees no reason why it should be allowed to disturb their Christian fellowship, and break up the peace of the Church. It was not long, however, till his eyes were opened by the course of events, and by the representations probably of Hosius, to see that the question involved for the whole Church a great deal more than he had at first supposed. Finally, the only proper remedy for the case seemed to be the calling of a general council, where the bishops of the whole Christian world should be invited to come together, and take part in settling what was felt to have become a vital difficulty for the universal Church. This First Oecumenical Council, as it is called, met at Nice in the year 325. It was composed of three hundred and eighteen bishops, mainly Oriental. Here, as all the world knows, Arius and his party were met with overwhelming defeat. Very few of the bishops, not more than twenty-two, it is said, were found to agree in full with his views. The rest might not all have been prepared to go with Alexander at every point, but when it came to the main question in controversy—the participation of the Son in the essence of the

Father—they could not hesitate on which side to cast their vote. Their Christian consciousness was stronger for them here than all speculative difficulties. A confession of Arian sound, drawn up by Eusebius of Nicomedia, was rejected with horror, and in place of it was adopted that great bulwark of the Christian faith, the *Nicene Creed*, as it has been since known—strengthened by the addition to its first draught of the term ὁμοούσιος, to cut off all possible ambiguous apprehension. Here we have a real dogmatic movement in the Christian world; what lay in the faith of the Church previously was now brought to doctrinal expression as it had never been before. From this time on, the relation of the Son to the Father must be held to be one of full equality as well as full distinction. He is "begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made; of *one substance* (ὁμοούσιος) with the Father, by whom all things were made." So much has been settled and fixed for us by this ever memorable confession of Nice.

Among those who showed themselves particularly active in favor of the formula, stood conspicuous the youthful Athanasius, now deacon of the Alexandrian Church, who already gave signs of the herculean strength, which he was destined to put forth in its defence in subsequent years. Arius and two other bishops who refused to sign the confession, were excluded from the communion of the Church, and banished into Illyrium. All writings of Arius must be given up to be burned on pain of death; and his followers were stigmatized (at the same time) with the name of Porphyrians, that is, enemies of Christianity. The confession was a vast victory in favor of the truth. It soon appeared, however, that it was not sufficient of itself to bring to an end the theological controversy out of which it grew. The Asiatic bishops awaited only for a favorable opportunity to take ground against the term ὁμοούσιος. At first the Emperor showed a disposition to maintain rigorously the authority of the council. The orthodox cause might be said to be strengthened also, when Athanasius, the soul of the movement, was made bishop of Alexandria, in the room of Alexander, who had died soon after

his return from Nice. Gradually, however, a change took place in the condition of affairs. The Emperor was surrounded continually with those who were not favorable to the doctrine of the essential equality of the Son with the Father, but took pains rather to represent the whole controversy as an empty logomachy. Constantine was always very dependent, in theological matters, upon his nearest advisers. It was easy to persuade him that personal passion had been much concerned in what he had regarded heretofore as a sincere zeal for Christianity. Finally, he invited Arius to come to the court, promising to send him back again to Alexandria. At the same time, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theognis of Nice, who had been previously banished to Gaul on account of their sympathy with the Arian cause, were permitted now also to return and resume their places. Eusebius set himself to work immediately to overthrow the Homoousians in Asia, singling out first for this purpose Eustathius of Antioch, a zealous defender of the Nicene symbol. A number of anti-Nicene bishops, through his influence, were brought together in Antioch, and here deposed Eustathius from his office, on the charge of Sabellianism. In opposition to the will of his own congregation, Paullinus of Tyre was now named bishop of Antioch. There was still, however, a party of Eustathians in the place, who kept up their separate meetings. The same charge of Sabellianism, brought against Asklepas, bishop of Gaza, and Eutropius, bishop of Adrianople, served as a pretext for depriving them also of their offices. Encouraged by such successes, the anti-Nicene party turned their attention next to Athanasius himself. Backed by a letter from Eusebius, Arius had applied personally in Alexandria to be restored to his office as Presbyter. This Athanasius had refused, maintaining his position subsequently with great firmness against the Emperor himself, and insisted that a heretic, deposed as Arius had been by the authority of the Synod, could not be restored again to church communion without similar authority. New complaints, brought against the bishop by the Meletians, who stood in intimate connection with the Arian faction at Alexandria, induced the Emperor to summon him to his

court in Nicomedia. Here he made such an impression upon the Emperor, that he wrote a letter commending him to the Church at Alexandria as a man of God, and censuring their divisions and strifes. As, however, all manner of strange accusations continued to be preferred against Athanasius, Constantine appointed a council at Cesarea (333) to inquire into the case. In view of the fact that Eusebius of Cesarea was to preside over this ecclesiastical court, Athanasius did not make his appearance. In the year 335 a new council was ordered to come together at Tyre, where the Emperor threatened to bring Athanasius by force, should he again refuse to attend. Athanasius appeared at Tyre; but the charges against him, for the most part, resulted in nothing. It was then resolved to send a commission to Egypt, for the purpose of examining matters on the spot. The members of this commission were declared enemies of Athanasius, on whose report afterwards the council of Tyre deposed Athanasius from his office, and subjected him to a sentence of excommunication. Athanasius appealed from such a body to the Emperor himself, and made a journey to him personally at Constantinople. Constantine, however, after some show of new inquiry into the case, suffered himself to be carried away with the general prejudice against Athanasius; and, finally, for the sake of peace and rest, sent him into banishment at Treves (336). Nothing seemed to stand now in the way of the restoration of Arius. He returned accordingly to Alexandria, after having been received again into church communion at Jerusalem; but the people of Alexandria were too much devoted to their bishop, to endure the presence of the heretic without serious excitement and commotion. This led the Emperor to call him to Constantinople. Here he was required now to draw up a new confession of his faith, which he managed to do in Scriptural terms mainly, on which he could put his own sense. He used the farther precaution of making him solemnly swear that he held no other faith, and then issued an order to Alexander, the bishop of Constantinople, that he should publicly admit Arius the next day (Sunday) to the communion of his church. The bishop expostulated in vain; and

then, in his extremity, had recourse to God in earnest prayer. That same evening Arius perished suddenly and miserably, by the bursting out of his bowels in a privy. It seemed a Divine interposition; and the bishop considered it his duty to render thanks to God for it publicly in the church.

Constantine died a. 337. Under his sons, Athanasius was allowed to return to Alexandria. The influence of the court, however, was soon determined against the Nicene Synod. Eusebius of Nicomedia succeeded in making himself bishop of Constantinople, renewed his charges against Athanasius, and went so far even as to have a rival bishop appointed for the Arian party in Alexandria. Athanasius, to defend himself, called together a large council of Egyptian bishops (340), and made it an object especially to win to his side the judgment of Julius, the bishop of Rome, with whom also the anti-Nicene party were endeavoring to make interest. In the year 341 a council was held at Antioch, consisting of ninety bishops. Here several confessions were brought forward, in which the teaching of Arius was disapproved, and the generation of the Son from the Father affirmed as being before all time, without any mention of their essential equality. Athanasius was declared by the same Synod to be still deposed, as having resumed his office without regular authority. A certain Gregory of Cappadocia was then elected bishop of Alexandria, and sent to take possession of the see with an armed force, a task he was not able to accomplish without some shedding of blood. Athanasius escaped by flight, and appeared afterward at the synod held by Julius in Rome in the year 342, where he was formally sustained. None of the anti-Nicene party were in attendance. Julius communicated to them the results of the synod, which they took in very bad part, threatening to exclude him from church fellowship if he refused to acknowledge their decrees. The party sought now to gain the western Emperor Constans, sending a special embassy to Gaul for the purpose, but without effect. A new synod was held at Antioch in 345, where another longer confession of faith was produced, affirming the generation of the Son from the essence of the Father before all

time, without any notice still, however, of their consubstantial unity. No account was made of this by the Western Church, and the two emperors were petitioned, accordingly, to take measures for settling the controversy between the East and the West by a general council. This was called to meet at Sardica, in Illyrium, in the year 347. The whole measure, however, proved a disastrous failure. The Anti-nicene party hearing that Athanasius, Marcellus, and Paul of Constantinople were already treated as brethren by the Western bishops, insisted that they should first of all be kept out of the assembly until there might be a full and fair examination of their case. Not being able to carry this point, they withdrew in a body to Philippopolis, and held there a synod of their own. The bishops at Sardica confirmed the Nicene Creed, and declared the depositions of Athanasius, Marcellus, Asklepas of Gaza, and so on, to be invalid, whilst on the other hand the opposers of the Nicene Creed, Gregory of Alexandria, Basil of Ancyra, Acacius of Cesarea, and Stephen of Antioch, were excommunicated. At Philippopolis the heads of the Nicene party fell under the same censure. This was the end of all church fellowship between the two parties. An effort was now made to have Athanasius restored to his see by the help of the secular power, which, in the end, proved successful, through the influence of Constans on his brother Constantius. Gregory of Alexandria had been previously killed in a popular tumult, and the regular bishop was now received again by the people (349) with boundless jubilation. The administration of his diocese was carried on subsequently with great energy and effect, which only drew upon him, however, new hatred and opposition in the East.

After the death of Constans, the Orientals directed their assaults first against the Sabellian, Marcellus, and his disciple, Photinus of Sirmium. In a council at Sirmium in 351, Photinus was deposed from his office. Finding themselves favored by the political changes of the time, they now turned their attention again to Athanasius. They prevailed at first in making Liberius, the new bishop of Rome, doubtful of his cause; and

then, in a synod at Arles (353) succeeded in bringing all the members, the delegates of the Roman bishop among them, to unite in pronouncing against him a new sentence of deposition. This step roused the orthodox bishops of the West, particularly Lucifer of Cagliari, Eusebius of Vercelli, and Liberius of Rome, through whose influence, then, the emperor was moved to order a new Synod at Milan in the year 355. In this council three hundred bishops are said to have been present, mainly from the West. The favor of the emperor, however, gave the advantage to the Anti-nicene party. No authority was allowed to the Nicene Creed; the members were required even to subscribe an Anti-nicene edict of the Emperor. The meetings were first held in the church, but were transferred afterward to the palace of the Emperor, that they might be more entirely beyond the reach of the common people, who were known to be in strong sympathy with the orthodox cause. Here, finally, all who refused to consent to the deposition of Athanasius were themselves deprived of their dignities. This fortune fell upon Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, Hosius of Cordova, and at last on Liberius also, the bishop of Rome, who only became in this way, however, missionaries abroad for the doctrine of the Catholic Church. Felix, who took part in the proceedings at Milan, was named bishop of Rome instead of Liberius; but the Church there could not be brought to show him any favor.

The Imperial Commission, sent to remove Athanasius, proceeded at first very cautiously. There was reason to fear that the Egyptian people would resist the measure with violence. Only with the help of armed soldiers at last was the attempt made to seize his person, and then not without force and shedding of blood. Athanasius, who carried himself with great courage through the occasion, sought refuge finally, among the Anchorites of the desert, where he employed his leisure in writing against the doctrines of the party to which he stood opposed. That party, in a synod at Antioch, had named George of Cappadocia, a notoriously unworthy man, as bishop of Alexandria. He was installed in that see (356) by force of arms,

and ruled it afterward with a rod of iron. The Anti-nicene party triumphed in this way over the Nicene symbol by means of the secular power; its victory, however, only paved the way for its subsequent dissolution, through the falling assunder of the different views that were comprehended in it, which had been held together thus far, only by their common opposition to the Nicene Creed.

Arianism was the occasion of the vast theological agitation which was now felt throughout the Christian world. It had led to the Council of Nice, and called forth the Nicene Creed; and in this way it might be said to have made room for all the questioning and controversy, through which the symbol was required to pass afterwards, before it became established with full authority as the only true and proper expression of the universal Christian faith. It was, however, but a small part of the opposition to the Nicene symbol that could be said to stand on strictly Arian ground; and this again was by no means united in its opinions. Some, like the worldly-minded bishops Ursacius and Valens, contented themselves with a blind acquiescence in the views of Arius, and a mere negative rejection of the Nicene points of faith, while others felt themselves impelled to carry out their own system in a more positive and explicit way. Conspicuous among these appear the names of Aetius and Eunomius, from whom the party came to be designated as Aetians and Eunomians; while they were called, also, sometimes Anomoeans, from their insisting so strenuously that the Son was not of one substance (*ἀνομοιος*) with the Father. These zealous teachers, Eunomius in particular, had much to say of the absolute simplicity of the Divine nature, the being of God conceived of in the most abstract way, which made it impossible, they contended, that his substance could be conveyed by any generation to another; the Son could not be, therefore, absolutely like the Father, but must be regarded as the production of the Father's will out of nothing, though endowed with power to create the world, and exalted thus far above all other creatures. Such was the thinking and reasoning of the strict Arians. Over against these stood the far larger party of the

Semi-arians, or Homoiousians, sometimes called also Eusebians, from their distinguishing representative, Eusebius of Cesarea, an unsteady fluctuating party, which felt itself pressed continually between the Arian and Nicene schemes of thought, without the power of finding any firm middle ground of its own on which to stand. Their significance was more ecclesiastical than dogmatic. They contributed in truth but little to the movement of theological thought. Their concern all the time was to maintain the distinction between the Father and the Son, which they supposed must fall away, if both were allowed to be of one substance. They would have it, therefore, that the Son was of *like* substance with the Father (ὁμοιούσιος). Athanasius argued against them that likeness or unlikeness could not be predicated of substance, but only of attributes; that in the case of substance, we could only speak of sameness or the reverse. By the strict Arians, on the other hand, it was held up to them that mere likeness of substance here amounted necessarily to difference of substance, and so drew after it inevitably all that was embraced in the Arian view. Finding itself thus hard pushed on both sides, the party was led more and more through the force of its religious instincts, to disown Arianism and make common cause with the Nicene faith, until, finally, having become reconciled to it at all points, it ceased to exist altogether. Indeed, Semi-nicene, rather than Semi-arian, would seem to have been the proper title for the party from the first.

Under the leadership of Aetius and Eunomius, the strict Arians endeavored to carry things forward in a way that proved highly unsatisfactory in different quarters, to their Semi-arian allies. Aetius had distinguished himself all along for his intemperate zeal against the holders of the orthodox faith. In 349 we find him laboring to have them sundered from the Arian communion in Antioch. Forced to leave that place, he meets us again at the Council of Sirmium, 351, where his extreme views were opposed by the Semi-arian bishops, Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius of Sebaste. Four years after this, he is actively at work in Alexandria, trying to build up the Arian cause there, under the auspices of the new bishop, George of Cappadocia.

Here he fell in with Eunomius, and the two together became from this time on the life and soul of the party. In the year 357, the Emperor Constantius made his first visit to Rome, and to please the people there promised them, among other things, the return of their bishop, if only he would sign the condemnation of Athanasius. The same year a new synod was held at Sirmium, where a formula was adopted, through the influence particularly of Ursacius and Valens, according to which, for the sake of peace among all parties, no farther use was to be made of the terms *οὐσία*, *ὁμοούσιος* and *ὁμοιούσιος* in teaching or preaching, while, nevertheless, the subordination of the Son to the Father, and the generation of the Son from the Father, were to be acknowledged and affirmed as facts transcending all knowledge. The aged bishop, Hosius, was induced to sign this formula, along with the condemnation of Athanasius; and, having done so, recovered his see, but died the following year. Liberius also yielded, and on the same terms became once more bishop of Rome, having deserted apparently the cause of the great and good Athanasius, for that of his foes. It appeared now, however, that the Semi-arians were not disposed to acquiesce in this doubtful compromise; the more especially so when it was found that the strict Arians looked upon it as a great triumph for their cause, and on the strength of it allowed themselves to take high airs against their opponents. Particularly was this case in the diocese of Antioch, where the leaders of the party began to put out of office such as refused to conform to their views. This led to a Semi-arian council at Ancyra, which issued a declaration, insisting on the necessity of maintaining the relation of *like* substance between the Father and the Son, and at the same time sent a special delegation to the emperor at Sirmium, to let him know that the late form of concord had failed to secure peace, and was used by the Arians only as an occasion for persecution. The emperor was induced to order another convention of bishops at Sirmium (358); and here now a new confession was adopted, rejecting the formula of the previous year, and settling the term "like substance" as the only rule of right belief in the

case. All must now sign this; among others, Ursacius and Valens, who excused themselves for their having rejected the ὁμοιούσιος before, by saying they had considered it to be of one meaning with ὁμοούσιος. Liberius, too, had to sign. After this, we find the Arians in trouble. They had incurred the anger of the emperor, as disturbers of the peace; many leaders among them lost their places; about seventy were sent into exile. Finally, a fourth confession was produced at Sirmium, avoiding the word οὐσία, but declaring the Son to be like the Father in all things (ὅμοιος κατὰ πάντα), according to the Scriptures. This now Constantius proposed to have established, by means of a General Council, as an end of all strife. It was settled at last, however, that instead of a General Council two different synods should be held, one for the East and another for the West. The Western bishops met at Rimini, about four hundred in number; among them, perhaps, eighty holding Arian views. The last Semi-arian formula, approved by the Emperor, was laid before them, but the majority would hear of nothing but the Nicene symbol, and proceeded to depose the Arians, Ursacius, Valens, and others, from their office. Ten of their number were sent as a delegation to the emperor, but the Arians were before them, and the emperor kept them at a distance. Finally they were ordered to Nice in Thrace; and here a Semi-arian confession was offered them to sign, to which in the end, through weariness and fear, they reluctantly set their names. Almost all the bishops assembled at Rimini were brought afterwards to do the same thing. This was in the year 359. Somewhat later in the same year, the Oriental bishops assembled at Seleucia in Isauria—one hundred and five Semi-arians, forty strict Arians, and some ten or twelve confessors of the Nicene faith. Among these last was the celebrated Hilary, Bishop of Poictiers, whom the emperor himself had ordered from his banishment in Phrygia expressly to attend this synod. Here it came at once to an active struggle between the Arians and the Semi-arians. At the head of the Arians stood Acacius of Cesarea, the successor of Eusebius. The Semi-arians succeeded in requiring subscription to a form, which served to

bring Acacius and his party to the point of acknowledging finally that the likeness of the Son to the Father was held by them to be moral only, (in the will and not in the substance), whereupon they were summarily ejected from their places. Both sides sent embassies to the emperor; but here again the Arians were ahead of their adversaries, and Acacius managed for a time to secure his favor. But this did not last. The undisguised sentiments of the Arians, as they were brought to his view in one of their published works, excited his strong displeasure; and when it turned out that Aetius had written it, he was banished into Phrygia. Still the Semi-arians were not sustained in their distinctive position; and the Arians, in this way, might be said to have been left masters of the field.

In a council held at Constantinople, in the year 300, the heads of the Semi-arian party, Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, and Macedonius of Constantinople, were deposed, to make room for Arian successors. Eudoxius became, in this way, bishop of Constantinople. With all its success, however, the party found it necessary to keep its real views more or less out of sight. Eunomius, made bishop of Cyzicum for his Arianism, lost his bishopric again in a short time, for preaching Arianism in too free a way. A council in Antioch, in 361, proposed to strike from the Church creeds all expressions referring the likeness of the Son to the Father, but the measure was not carried through. It seemed too bold to be safe.

Under Julian, the successor of Constantius (361), permission was granted to all banished bishops to return to their places. This first made room for the orthodox doctrine to raise its head again in the West. Hilary of Poictiers had a synod convened in Paris, where confession was made once more of the Nicene Creed. In Alexandria, the Arian bishop, George, was killed in the midst of a popular tumult. Athanasius now returned to his see, and endeavored with gentleness to bring about a general restoration of order and peace; on the plan of allowing all to retain their places who would sign the Nicene symbol, even if they had been led previously through weakness to subscribe to Arian formulas; so as to exclude from office only

the active leaders of the party. This moderation was condemned by Lucifer of Cagliari, and gave rise to a particular party who took their title from his name.

In the year 364, Valens became emperor of the East; a weak and cruel prince, who lent himself entirely to the Arian, cause, and tried to put down all opposition to it by active persecution. This had the effect of disposing the Semi-arians, still more than before to look favorably toward the Nicene doctrine, as being perhaps after all the only ground on which the heresy could be successfully withstood. A powerful influence was exerted now also in the same direction by the great church teachers, Gregory of Nazianzum, Basil of Neo-Cesarea, and Gregory of Nyssa, who vigorously maintained the Athanasian faith, and labored to bring the Oriental Church into union with the West. Finally a deputation was sent to the Roman bishop, Liberius, declaring the willingness of the East to accept the ὁμοούσιος. Letters from Western bishops consenting to a renewal of fellowship were presented in return at the council of Tyana, in 367. There were still some voices against the pacification; but the course of events silenced them more and more; till the triumph of orthodoxy became in the end full and complete. In the mean time, the Arian persecutions under Valens went on with great severity, filling the whole Eastern Church with dismay, and exciting no small sympathy in the West. All sorts of violence were exercised, in thrusting Catholics out of office, and in putting Arians into their place. These persecutions lasted till the death of Valens in 378. Under his successor, Gratian, there was general toleration. Theodosius the Great finally turned the power of the State against the Arians. He issued an order (380), requiring his subjects to hold the same faith with the bishops of Rome and Alexandria, on pain of being regarded and treated as heretics. This, of course, gave the State churches everywhere to orthodox incumbents, and forced the Arians to hold their religious assemblies outside the cities. In the year 381 the second Œcumenical council was held at Constantinople; which solemnly reaffirmed the Nicene Creed, extending the oneness of God's es-

sence at the same time to the Holy Ghost. This was followed in subsequent years, during the reign of Theodosius, with new and more rigorous laws against the Arians. All tended now to deprive their cause of credit and strength; while they were weakened also by divisions among themselves. We hear still of occasional movements among them, for a time, in opposition to the reigning faith; but under the next emperor, Arcadius, they disappeared historically from the Roman empire altogether. The heresy had run its course, and lost its interest now in new questions and controversies which arose to agitate the Christian world in its place.

Long after this, however, Arianism maintained its ground among the Germanic tribes on the outside of the Roman empire. It seemed to be for them a sort of transition stage from Paganism to full Christianity. The entire nation of the Ostrogoths continued to profess the Arian faith, till the time of their destruction in 555; without any persecution, however, of Catholics. The Visigoths showed themselves more intolerant in the exercise of the same faith but finally, in a church council held at Toledo 589, were induced by their king Reccared to adopt the Nicene confession. The Arian Vandals after their conquest of Africa under Genseric 429 inflicted a severe persecution upon the Catholics; which came to an end only with the destruction of the Vandal kingdom by Belisarius in the year 534. The Suevi in Spain passed over to Arianism in the middle of the fifth century, in consequence probably of their connection with the Visigoths; one hundred years later, about 558, they were converted under king Theodemir to the orthodox religion. The Burgundians also who were heathen when they came in to Gaul (417), very soon after made a profession of Arianism (440). Arian ministers, now that the heresy had been driven out of the Roman empire, endeavored to prepare here a favorable soil for their doctrine. The neighborhood of the Visigoths also worked probably in the same direction. Among this people Aristus of Vienne exerted himself actively in favor of Catholicism, and succeeded in winning to it Sigismund, the son of king Gundobad; with whose accession to the government

then (517) the Catholic Church became established in Burgundy. The Arian doctrine held its place longest of all among the Longobards. They came as Arians 568 into Italy, with hostile feeling toward Catholics; but after the Bavarian princess Theudelinda became the wife of king Antharis the Catholic faith gained entrance also among them, and under her son Adelwald the use of the churches was again allowed to the Catholics. The conversion however, was not complete; a reaction followed, and we find an Arian again upon the throne. Still Catholicism could not be again suppressed; in all the cities there was a Catholic together with an Arian bishop. Under Luitprand (†744) the Catholic Church was established at last in full power. Thus after centuries Arianism died out altogether in these countries; probably, however, not without leaving behind it an influence, which made itself felt on the same ground at a later period, in other forms of variation from, and opposition to, the doctrines of the Roman Church.

Sources for the history of Arianism; The church-historians, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Theodoret* (Catholic), and *Philostorgius* (Arian); the church-fathers, *Athanasius*, *Basil*, *Gregory of Nazianzum*, *Gregory of Nyssa*, *Epiphanius*, *Chrysostom*, *Hilary of Poictiers*, &c. Of the work of Arius entitled Thalia, only some fragments are preserved by Athanasius. Among later works on the subject may be mentioned, in addition to modern church-histories generally: *Maimbourg's* History of Arianism; *J. A. Star'k*, Versuch einer Gesch. des Arian.; *Whitaker's* Origin of Arianism; *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereien; *Newman's* Arians of the Fourth Century; *T. G. Hassenkamp*, Historia Arianae Controversiae; *Möhler*, Athanasius der Grosse und seine Zeit, 1827; *Baur*, Geschichte der Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit, 1841–43; *G. A. Meier*, die Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit in ihrer historischen Entwicklung, 1844; *J. A. Dorner*, Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi in den ersten vier Jahrhunderten, 1845; *Albert de Broglie*, L'Eglise et l'Empire Romain au IV siecle, 1856.

Art. VIII.—ATHANASIUS.

BY J. W. NEVIN, D. D., PRESIDENT OF FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA.

In some respects the most conspicuous name among the church fathers of the fourth century. Obscure in his origin, he became a beacon light for the Christian world, not only in his own age, but through all subsequent times. Small and insignificant in his outward person, he won for himself the highest renown by his intellectual and moral qualities; and deserved his honorary title of *The Great* quite as much as Constantine himself; being in the Church, indeed, no less than he was in the State, the centre and pivot around which the deepest interests of the age revolved. His name has been made immortal, especially through its association with the catholic doctrine of the Trinity, to whose defence he consecrated every moment and every faculty of his being. For this he lived, worked, prayed, suffered; counting no sacrifice or privation too great in the prosecution of his object; ready to stake upon it at all times the dearest interests of his existence. History offers us no more striking example of what may be accomplished by the force of a single will, when it is inflexibly applied to the pursuit of a single end or purpose. Archbishop of Alexandria for upwards of forty-six years, his long administration was spent in a perpetual combat against the powers of Arianism. Five times was he expelled from his throne; twenty years he passed as an exile or a fugitive; and almost every province of the Roman empire was successively witness to his sufferings, as well as to his unflinching constancy, in the service of the cause, which he considered as the sole pleasure and business, as the duty, and as the glory of his life. It was his great privilege, moreover, to see this cause, after long years of anxious care and toil, crowned at last with complete victory and success. Though it seemed to be for a time Athanasius against the world, he lived to see the world at last in

great measure on his side. His life in this respect, it has been well said, was like his character, beautifully round and complete. He finished the work he was appointed to fulfil, and was allowed finally to depart in peace.

Athanasius was born about the beginning of the fourth century. We hear of him first as a boy, on whom the attention of Alexander, the primate of Alexandria, was fixed, from observing him on a certain occasion playing the part of bishop among a company of other boys. Alexander was so struck with his appearance and manner, that he determined at once to have him educated for the service of the Church. He enjoyed in this way the advantage of the best ecclesiastical and classical training which the age could afford; and well did he profit by his opportunities. While still quite a young man, he distinguished himself by two very important and closely related theological works: *λόγος κατὰ Ἑλλήνων* (oratio contra Gentes), and *περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως του Λόγου* (de incarn. Verbi Dei); in which he appears familiar with the Gentile philosophy, but shows himself at the same time thoroughly possessed by the power of Christianity as an independent principle, both of life and of thought. This, however, was only the beginning of his broad and profound speculation in regard to the Divine Logos, which served to prepare him for the task that lay before him in the Arian controversy. With this he became confronted first as deacon in the church of Alexandria, when Arius, a presbyter in the same Church, set himself to oppose the views of his bishop on the subject of Christ's divinity; pushing the idea of the Son's subordination to the Father to its extreme consequence, the denial of His eternal existence, and charging with Sabellian heresy all who refused to acknowledge His created origin. Against this the true Christian consciousness revolted; feeling it to be derogatory to the proper dignity of Christ, and subversive in the end of the whole Christian salvation. It became an object, therefore, of more and more urgent necessity, to determine theologically the true relation of the Son to the Father, in such a way as to maintain the proper divinity of Christ, without falling into the error of Sabellianism. The Arian controversy of Egypt

became thus, in a short time, a controversy for the Christian Church at large; and the first general council, held at Nice in 325, was convened especially for the purpose of bringing it to some public settlement and end. Here Athanasius attended, in company with his aged bishop, Alexander; and although still a young man, contributed largely, by his learning and zeal, to the memorable result, which was finally reached through the deliberations of this venerable body. The test term ὁμοούσιος (consubstantial), in the Nicene Creed, was carried through especially by his influence. That proved to be, in fact, the distinguishing theological word, which was required to meet the emergency into which the Church had now come; and once spoken as it now was in this famous creed, it could never again be recalled. But the speaking of the right word was not, of itself, in this case, the full bringing out at once of all that was properly comprehended in it for the Christian faith; and a long, violent struggle was still needed afterwards, to save and perpetuate the true sense of the Nicene doctrine, as it has since come down to later times. It was an easy thing for the Church to join in the condemnation of Arius; but it was not so easy for it to be at once of one mind with regard to the positive sense of the creed, which the council of Nice had adopted by a sort of compromise, as the only way of meeting effectually, at the time, the Arian error. It was not, then, with Arianism only, in its proper form, that the Nicene doctrine was required subsequently to contend; it had a powerful opposition to encounter besides in the Semi-arian (or better, perhaps, Semi-nicene) party, which repudiated Arianism, without being able to regard the Son as being yet strictly "of one substance with the Father." The right word spoken at Nice, through the influence of Athanasius and others, was to be maintained against both these forms of error; to be maintained, as it soon appeared, by a testimony which was to call into requisition, not only the greatest theological learning and skill, but the most heroic courage also, as well as the most indomitable patience, kept up through long years both of ecclesiastical and of political persecution; and to Athanasius himself it fell, beyond all others, to lead the way in this mighty strug-

gle, and to become thus, under God, the saviour of the cause which he seemed to have been raised up specially to defend.

On the death of his friend and patron Alexander, he was chosen to succeed him (in the year 328, it would seem) as bishop of Alexandria and primate of Egypt. In this high position he came at once into collision with the will of the Emperor Constantine, who, through various influences, had been led to relax his zeal against Arianism; and having recalled Arius himself from his banishment, sought to have him restored to the communion of the Church at Alexandria. Athanasius steadily resisted the application, showing thus his personal firmness, and the sense he had of the proper independence of the Church in her own jurisdiction. Constantine was constrained to respect his inflexible resolution; but it served more and more to inflame against him the hatred of his theological enemies; who now set themselves to accomplish his overthrow, by scattering rumors and suspicions affecting his character in the most injurious way. He was charged with being proud and tyrannical in his office; in particular, with having violated the peace made with the schismatic followers of Meletius; by sacrilegiously breaking a chalice in one of their churches; by subjecting several of their bishops to corporal maltreatment; by actually murdering one of them, Arsenius, it was said, with his own hand. These complaints became so loud, that Constantine finally ordered a council to be held at Cesarea (333) for their examination; where, however, Athanasius refused to make his appearance, knowing that the tribunal was one from which he could hope for no justice. Another council was convened in the year 335 at Tyre to try the same cause, which he was now forced by the peremptory command of the emperor to attend. He appeared there at the head of fifty Egyptian prelates, having with him also, privately concealed in his train, the Meletian bishop Arsenius, whom he was accused of having deprived of his life. Eusebius, of Cesarea, presided over the synod with unbecoming partizan passion; by his numerous faction, Athanasius was saluted with the names of homicide and tyrant; the clamor was encouraged for a time by his patient silence; but it was com-

pletely confounded, of course, when at the proper moment Arsenius himself was produced alive and unhurt in the midst of the assembly. The other charges against him were found also to be without proof; but the synod was resolved beforehand on his condemnation; and now to keep up the show of judicial forms, it was determined to send an episcopal commission of six delegates to collect evidence against him in Alexandria. This commission, composed of his declared enemies, brought back such a report as the case was supposed by the majority of the synod to require; and a decree was forthwith passed and published, pronouncing sentence of degradation and exile against Athanasius in the fiercest terms of malice and revenge. Athanasius himself before this, however, seeing how the case was going, had already taken the bold and dangerous step of quitting Tyre, and making his way to Constantinople, for the purpose of bringing his cause personally before the emperor himself. Waiting for a proper opportunity, he suddenly threw himself in the way of his offended sovereign as he was passing on horseback through the principal street of the city. Constantine was struck with surprise; then with anger; but, in the end, with respect and religious awe. He listened graciously to the complaints of Athanasius; and finally summoned the leading members of the council of Tyre to give an account of their proceedings in his presence. They now contrived, however, to add a serious political crimination to the other charges preferred against him; and so, for the sake of general peace and quiet, the emperor considered it best, after long hesitation, to let the sentence against him go into present effect. His see was allowed to remain vacant; while he himself was remanded to the city of Treves, in Gaul. Here he remained about twenty-eight months.

The death of Constantine changed the face of public affairs. By an honorable edict, Athanasius was allowed (338) to return to Alexandria. But he soon found himself exposed to new persecutions. The feeble emperor Constantius surrendered himself completely to the views of the Anti-nicene party; which now renewed its complaints against Athanasius, and sought to thrust him again from his see; as one who had violated the proper order

of the Church, it was said, in resuming his episcopal functions before he had been properly absolved from the sentence of degradation which had been passed upon him by the council of Tyre. A council of ninety bishops came together finally at Antioch (341), which, after formal consideration of his case, renewed or confirmed his deposition, and named as his successor a certain Gregory of Cappadocia; whose induction into office was accomplished afterwards only by military force and violence, against the wishes of the people. Athanasius now betook himself to Rome; where he sought interest in favor of his cause with Julius, the bishop of Rome, and with the clergy of the West generally; making himself master of the Latin language, and prosecuting his negotiations with great earnestness through a period of several years. A council of fifty bishops of Italy, in 342, pronounced a declaration unanimously in his favor; which so affronted the Anti-nicene Asiatics, that they threatened to break communion with Julius if he would not respect their decrees. The case was brought thus to an open antagonism between the West and the East. An attempt was made to have the difficulty settled, by a council which was called to meet at Sardica in 347, and which was to be composed of representatives from both sections of the Church. The measure only resulted, however, in making the breach worse than before. The Asiatics now drew off from the meeting, and formed themselves into a rival synod at Philippopolis, in Thrace; each body fulminated its decrees against the other; there was a formal end of church communion between the Nicene and Anti-nicene parties. Revered as a saint in the West, Athanasius was held up as a criminal to the abhorrence of the East. In the meantime, political influences were brought to work powerfully in his favor. Constans, the sovereign of the West, into whose presence Athanasius had been personally admitted on several occasions during his second exile, was finally engaged to espouse his cause, in a way that secured him justice in spite of all the machinations of his religious foes. By a brief and peremptory letter to his brother Constantius, the emperor of the East, he gave him to understand, that unless he consented to the immediate restoration of Athanasius, he him-

self, with a fleet and army, would bring him back to Alexandria. Constantius yielded to this demand; and in the year 349 the archbishop returned once more to his see. Gregory, of Cappadocia, was no longer in the way, having been murdered previously in a popular tumult. The entrance of Athanasius into his capital was a triumphal procession; absence and persecution had endeared him to the people; his authority was more firmly established than before, as it was exercised now also with new vigor; and his fame was diffused over the whole extent of the Christian world.

But his sufferings were not yet at an end. The death of Constans left him again without political protection; and it soon became manifest that the zeal of his enemies against him was as virulent and active as ever. The civil war, occasioned by the usurpation of Magnentius, secured him a respite of three years; then it appeared that Constantius himself, now sole monarch of the whole Roman empire, was bent with the animosity of a private quarrel on compassing his destruction. But this he could not do in the way of direct absolute power; the privileges of the Church had already revived a sense of order and freedom in the Roman government; he must proceed, therefore, with circuitous caution, negotiation, and delay. The sentence pronounced against Athanasius by the synod of Tyre had never been expressly repealed; but it was felt now all-important to have it supported by the concurrence of the Latin bishops. Two years were consumed in negotiations for this purpose; and the important cause was solemnly debated, first in the synod of Arles (353), and afterwards in the great council of Milan (355), which consisted of above three hundred bishops. Through the influence of the emperor, the Anti-nicene cause in these assemblies prevailed; Athanasius was condemned; and all who refused to subscribe the sentence afterwards were immediately banished by the emperor, in obedience, as he pretended, to the decrees of the Catholic Church. Especially conspicuous among this band of confessors and exiles were Liberius of Rome, and the venerable Hosius of Cordova, who was revered as the favorite of the great Constantine, and the father of the Nicene faith.

These showed at first great resolution in going into exile; but, in the end, even their courage gave way; and the Athanasian cause received its heaviest blow, when, for the purpose of recovering their sees (Hosius then one hundred years old), they allowed themselves to subscribe a formula put forth by the second council of Sirmium (357), in which the Nicene faith was virtually surrendered, and the condemnation of its great champion approved. In the meantime, the storm of persecution had burst in full force over the devoted head of Athanasius himself.

A verbal message was sent to him in the first place from the emperor, announcing the order of his banishment; which, it was hoped, might be carried into effect in this way, without any public commotion. Athanasius, however, disputed the truth of an order, which seemed so manifestly unreasonable and unjust; and the civil powers of Egypt agreed to suspend proceedings till the emperor's pleasure should be more distinctly ascertained. But the truce was hollow and false; by secret orders the legions of Upper Egypt and Lybia were brought by hasty marches to Alexandria, and introduced into the heart of the city before any effectual measures could be taken for its defence. At the hour of midnight, Syrianus, duke of Egypt, at the head of five thousand armed soldiers, unexpectedly invested the church of St. Thomas, where Athanasius, with a part of his clergy and people, were engaged with their nocturnal devotions. A terrible scene of violence followed. Seated on his throne, the archbishop expected, with calm and intrepid dignity, the approach of death. While the public service was interrupted by shouts of rage and cries of terror, he animated the congregation to join in chanting one of the psalms of David, which celebrates the triumph of the God of Israel over the proud and impious tyrant of Egypt. At length the doors were burst open; a cloud of arrows was discharged among the people; the soldiers rushed forward, with drawn swords, into the sanctuary; and the dreadful gleam of their arms was reflected by the holy luminaries which burned around the altar. Athanasius nobly refused to desert his episcopal station, till he had dismissed in safety the last of the congregation; then, amid the darkness and tumult of the night,

though hard pressed, and thrown to the ground for a time without sense or motion, he succeeded wonderfully in effecting at last his escape. From that moment the primate of Egypt disappeared from the eyes of his enemies, and remained above six years concealed in impenetrable obscurity.

The assault on the church of St. Thomas, on this memorable occasion, was only the beginning of continued scenes of violence and confusion that now took place in Alexandria. The three other churches of the place were profaned by similar outrages; and during at least four months, the city was exposed to the insults of a licentious army, stimulated by the rancorous enemies of the Catholic faith. The worst horrors of war prevailed in every direction. Under the mask of religious zeal, lust, avarice, and private resentment, were gratified with impunity, and even with applause. To crown all, room was made for a successor of Athanasius, in the person of the famous George, of Cappadocia; who, having received the consecration of an Arian Synod, was placed upon the episcopal throne by an armed force (356), and showed himself in the exercise of this power afterwards a perfect tyrant, regardless alike of justice, humanity, and religion. Under his administration, the same scenes of violence and scandal which had been enacted in the capital, were repeated in more than ninety episcopal cities of Egypt. Constantius in the end approved of all that was done, and in a public letter congratulated the people of Alexandria on their happy deliverance, extolling the virtues of the monster George, and denouncing Athanasius as a wicked troubler of the public peace, who had confessed his guilt by flying from justice, and whose seditious adherents he was determined to pursue thenceforth with fire and sword. The most determined measures were adopted to reach the fugitive bishop; all the powers of the empire, civil and military, were set in motion for his arrest; liberal rewards were promised to any one who should produce him either alive or dead; and the most severe penalties were denounced against those who should dare to give him protection.

And where, in the meantime, was Athanasius? He had found refuge in the deserts of Thebais, which were now peopled

by thousands of monks, the disciples of Antony and Pachomius; by whom he was welcomed as a father, and who stood ready to devote their lives, if need be, to his service. Conforming to their mode of life, and lost in their multitudinous society, he was here fairly beyond the reach of his adversaries. The monks served him faithfully as guards, as secretaries, and his messengers; and by their means he was enabled to maintain more or less constant communication still with his bereaved flock. Not content with this, however, he even ventured at times to emerge from the desert, and to trust himself personally to the discretion of his friends and adherents in Alexandria. His various adventures in these daring visits, might have formed the subject of a very interesting romance. He seems to have been actually present, secretly, at the councils of Rimini and Scleucia. Though out of sight for his enemies, he made his presence felt everywhere to their confusion. Constantius received from his invisible hand wound after wound, which he could neither heal nor revenge. His seasonable writings, widely circulated and eagerly read, served to unite and animate the orthodox party; and altogether, Athanasius working from the depths of the desert, was as much a living power for the world at large, as ever he had been while seated on his episcopal throne in Alexandria.

Constantius died toward the close of the year 361, and was followed by Julian the Apostate; under whom the exiled bishops generally received permission to return to their sees. The announcement of Julian's accession in Alexandria, was, at the same time, the signal for the downfall of the infamous George of Cappadocia, the Arian usurper of the episcopal throne in that city. He had exercised his power in a way that made him an object of general abhorrence; and no sooner was it known now that he had lost his imperial support by the death of Constantius, than the fury of the people began to cry out against him for vengeance, and rested not till he was miserably destroyed by a public mob, too impatient to wait for the tedious forms of law. In this way full room was made for Athanasius quietly to resume his office. He was received amidst the public acclamations of the city; and at once addressed himself, with

wise and prudent zeal, to the task of composing and healing the disorders with which he was surrounded. His pastoral labors, at the same time, were not confined to the narrow limits of Egypt, but made themselves felt now auspiciously throughout the Christian world. The time was favorable for his influence, and he knew how to exercise it with temperate moderation, worthy of the great cause to which he had devoted his life. The success of the Anti-nicene cause, under Constantius, had prepared the way for its dissolution, by bringing out in full force the principle of discord which it carried in its own bosom. Intoxicated with their seeming triumph, the Arians, properly so called, sought to carry all things with a high hand in their own favor. This had the effect of bringing the better portion of the middle party, the Semi-arians, to distrust more and more the alliance in which they had come to stand with those whose doctrine and spirit now revealed themselves in such unfavorable light; and altogether, during the last years of Constantius, a wide-spread reaction of sentiment had begun to make itself felt in favor of the persecuted Nicene faith. Athanasius understood how to take advantage of this in the way of general conciliation; and his wise and moderate counsels contributed far and wide to restore the shattered unity of the Church on the proper foundation of theological truth.

Such successful zeal for Christianity, however, soon drew upon him the notice and indignation of the Pagan emperor Julian; who now took occasion to charge him with having resumed his episcopal functions without proper authority, and again ordered him into banishment. Athanasius withdrew once more to the monasteries of the desert.

The death of Julian, in 363, opened the way for his return. On the first intelligence of the fact, the intrepid veteran of the faith, now seventy years old, came forth from his retreat, and was received back into Alexandria again amid the most lively demonstrations of public joy. He immediately made a journey to Antioch, where the new emperor, Jovian, had established his court; and in several conferences with him, succeeded in securing his favor completely, both for himself, and for the cause

that was dearer to him than his own life. He then returned in triumph to his diocese, and continued, with mature counsels and undiminished vigor, to direct, ten years longer, the ecclesiastical government of Alexandria, Egypt, and the Catholic Church. There was a slight interruption to his activity afterwards, indeed, under Valens, who, as Emperor of the East (364), had embraced the Arian religion, and then considered it his duty to persecute the Catholics, or *Athanasian heretics*, as he called them, in all possible ways. Taking advantage of this, the enemies of Athanasius attempted to disturb the last years of his venerable age; and he found it necessary, at one time, to take refuge, for a short season, in his father's sepulchre; a retreat, which has been made to count as his fifth exile. But it came to no full banishment in fact. The zeal of a great people, who instantly flew to arms, intimidated the imperial prefect; and the heroic primate was permitted to end his life not only in peace, but also in a sunset of glory, after a reign, which fell but little short of nearly a full half century of years.

Our knowledge of Athanasius is derived largely from his own works; which are partly apologetic, partly polemic, partly exegetical, partly homilies, letters, &c. The principal editions are: That of the Benedictine monks (*Athan. opera ed. Montfaucon*, Paris, 1698, 3 T. fol.); and that of *N. A. Guistiniani* (Patav. et Lips. 1777, 4 T. fol.) We have a panegyric upon him, rather than a proper biography, written by *Gregory of Nanzianzum*. In later times, pains have been taken to place his history in proper light by *Papebroch*, in act Sanct. maj. I. 186; *Montfaucon*, in ed. opp.; and *Tillemont*, Memoires VIII. A graphic account of his character and fortunes may be found in *Gibbon's* History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Specially deserving of attention, however, are the late monographs: *I. A. Möhler*, Athanasius der Grosse und die Kirche seiner Zeit, comprising a careful representation of his doctrine, with an analysis of his principal writings; and *Böhringer*, in his Kirchengeschicte in Biographien I. 2; also *Neander*, in his Church History. Compare Bishop *Kaye*, in his Council of Nice, 1853. Thorough expositions of the doctrine of Athanasius may be found

in *Ritter's* Geschichte der Christl. Philosophie; in *Baur*, die Christliche Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit, &c; and in *Dorner's* admirable Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi.

Art. IX.—CORNELIUS' MEMORIAL.

BY REV. W. M. REILY, A. M., LEWISBURG, PA.

Cornelius, of Cesarea, was a Gentile; but, as was the case with many others of this class of persons, whom we meet with in the New Testament, he was a man of an earnest, humble, and religious mind. He was by birth a Roman, and no doubt was brought up in the faith of his countrymen. Through intercourse with the Jews, whilst stationed as an officer of a provincial garrison in Palestine, he became convinced of the error of Polytheism, and embraced the faith of the one only living and true God. That he was sincere in his belief in the religion of Israel, is evident from the fidelity with which he complied with the requirements it made of him.

There is no doubt but that he participated in the hope of the Messiah, which this nation so faithfully cherished. His religious wants were not yet fully met. Joy and peace in the Holy Ghost were not yet his. He longed for something still higher and better than he had hitherto attained. The intensity of his yearnings was manifested by his fasting,* his almsgiving, and his prayers. His aspirations were not in vain, nor were his labors futile. An angel appears to him, bringing him a message from Heaven. "Cornelius, thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God." We learn from the ensuing history what this indicated. His desires were realized. For doing as the messenger of God directed him, he found the truth as it is in Jesus, he was made, with his family, to rejoice under the powerful working of the Holy Ghost, and his name

* See Acts x. 30

goes down to all future generations as the first of that countless number of Gentiles, who go to compose the mystical body of the Son of God.

Attention is asked to the contents of the celestial message; viz., *Cornelius' prayers and alms as a memorial before God.*

These two things are here brought together in such a way, that what is said of one, is, in the same sense, said of the other. In like manner with the prayers, the alms are a memorial. As related simply to the former, it is not difficult for us to comprehend the expression. When the angel told Cornelius that his prayers came up as a memorial before God, he intended three things:

1. That God heeded his prayers. No petition is addressed to the throne of the heavenly grace, which is not in some sense heard and regarded. No movement of the lips, or emotion of the heart, escapes the notice of the Almighty. But there are prayers offered of an improper kind, and presented in an improper way. To such God is said to turn a deaf ear. But the prayers of Cornelius were heard and accepted.

2. The angel intended that God held Cornelius' prayers in remembrance. Many of them had not been answered. Hitherto he had looked and waited in vain. What a comfort it was to him now to know that all were still fresh before the mind of the Almighty! Like the incense of a chosen offering, they had risen and remained in the presence of Him who lives and reigns on high. Blessed be God, that He does not forget the pious petitions of His people! We are often tempted to think He does. So many seem to be in vain. But no truly devout utterance, or groan or sigh, directed heavenward, is lost. They are kept in mind by our Heavenly Father, and stand together forever as our memorial before Him.

3. The angel intended that Cornelius' prayers should be answered. God had already begun to answer. This divinely commissioned messenger comes to communicate with him. In the person of such an ambassador, Jehovah smiles graciously upon him, and causes him to feel that he is the object of His favor. He sends to him thus the assurance of still further mani-

festations of His condescension and love. Through the Angel he is brought into company with Simon Peter, the great Apostle of our Lord, who recounts to him the deeds of redeeming grace, and leads him to the foot of the cross. Thus his highest expectations are soon fulfilled, and answer to his prayers abundantly vouchsafed.

Now, according to the Angel's message, Cornelius' alms went together with his prayers, and were looked upon by God as a memorial, in the same light.

1. Accordingly, God observed his alms. And this He did in a sense different from that, in which He is said to observe all that is taking place in the universe. It is true, a sparrow does not fall to the ground without His notice. But we can easily appreciate the remark, when it is stated, that it is a specific notice that He takes of every religious effort and act. When we seek the knowledge of God through the study of His Word, does He not heed us? When we come to the table of the Lord, seeking a closer union with our Redeemer, does he not in a special manner regard us? When we come into His house to engage in His most excellent worship and praise, something is meant by the assurance that his merciful eye is upon us. And is not almsgiving a part of such service? With our prayers, they go to form that offering of thankfulness, which we present to our Heavenly Father, and which is acceptable to Him.

By this, however, we do not wish to say, that our alms are meritorious; in other words, that they purchase for us the Divine favor. Nor did the Angel intend this in his message to Cornelius. Why is it, then, that God notices them with pleasure?

The command has been given us: "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven also is perfect." What, now, can be more pleasing to God, than to see His children seeking this perfection? It must be with joy that he beholds every earnest effort to become like Him. We humble ourselves in penitence and grief, in view of our shortcomings and transgressions. Here is an act, in which we mortify our sinful dispositions and lusts; and in so far it is an effort in the direction of conformity to the

image of God. Is it not, therefore, heeded by Him? "The sacrifice of a broken and contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise." It is the same with the practice of patience, of forgiveness, of condescension. And what is to be said now of almsgiving? This is done from love and pity towards the suffering and destitute. Every offering we make of this kind is in the exercise of charity, and by exercise, as is the case with other virtues, and all our faculties, our charity increases; and the more we have of it, the more we become like God; for God is love. It was because Cornelius' fasting, prayers, and almsgiving, were honest strugglings after the perfect holiness, purity, and goodness of God, that they were regarded and accepted by Jehovah.

2. Cornelius' alms were remembered by God. No doubt this great benefactor had forgotten the most of the benefits which he had conferred upon the poor. Perhaps the sum, as well as the form and the object retained frequently no particular place in his remembrance. Likely all that did remain was the consciousness of having discharged his duty, and the sense of an increasing love toward the wretched and needy around him. But none of them was forgotten by God. A strict account was kept of every farthing bestowed, and the sum remained distinct before the mind of the omniscient One. What a solemn thought! Everything that we do in this way, everything that we ever have done, remains fresh in the memory of the Almighty, and stands before Him as our memorial forever. It is there to represent us, our character, our disposition, our religious earnestness and zeal:—the ever-abiding monuments of our faith, our thankfulness, our charity.

3. Like his prayers, Cornelius' alms return upon him with blessings. And it requires very little attention to the connection to see, that this was what the Angel mainly intended, when he told him that his prayers and his alms came up as a memorial before God. In view of what he was and had done, God was about in a special manner to bless him. And is not this in exact accordance with the teachings of the Word of God throughout? "He that giveth to the poor, lendeth to the Lord." "Ho-

nor the Lord with thy substance, and with the first-fruits of all thine increase, so shall thy barns be filled with plenty." The Apostle Paul tells us: "He that soweth sparingly, shall reap also sparingly; and he that soweth bountifully, shall reap also bountifully." And what he means by this, we learn from the following verse, where he says: "The Lord loveth a cheerful giver." Our Saviour admonishes us on this subject thus: "Sell that ye have and give alms: provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, which no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth." We will make but one more quotation, It is from St. Paul's first Epistle to Timothy: "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate, laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." The treasure which, according to our Saviour, we provide in heaven, and the foundation which, according to St. Paul, we lay up against the time to come, are the same with the memorial, which, according to the Angel's message, comes before God our Heavenly Father, and proves the source of celestial blessings.

We see thus from the case of Cornelius, that our prayers and alms fall under the same category, as acts of religious devotion acceptable to God; and that the one, as well as the other, in some mysterious way influences the Divine mind and will concerning us.

Cornelius' alms and prayers were of the proper character, and presented under the proper conditions. But we are well aware that thousands of prayers, and thousands of alms are offered, which by no means meet with Divine acceptance. What, now, are the requisites of true prayer and true almsgiving? The answer is precisely the same in both cases.

1. Our Catechism tells us that the first requisite of that prayer, which God is pleased with, and will hear, is that it be addressed to the only true God. And ought not our alms be presented as offerings to our Heavenly Father? and does He not recognize them as such? "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these little ones, ye have done it unto me."

2. Our prayers must be offered up with a sense of the need of those things which we ask for. When we pray for forgiveness, it is no real prayer, if we do not feel our guilt, and earnestly desire the favor of an offended God. In petition, the language is simply the expression of the feeling of the heart. The words are only the external form which the emotion of the soul assumes in unfolding and revealing itself. But coming as prayer distinctly to the light, the emotion amid proper surroundings, wings its way to the heavenly world, and comes acceptably into the presence of the Hearer and Answerer of prayer.

Our alms must likewise be the expression of the heart. They must spring from and manifest our love to the poor, and our interest in the cause of Christ. If Cornelius had given, merely with a view to the reward, or because he was forced to do so by the pressure of public opinion, his alms would not have come up as a memorial before God. His beneficence was his love and compassion going out toward their objects; his pious feeling taking to itself form and color. If it had been otherwise, his alms, like every thing else that is external, would have passed for nothing in the sight of God.

3. Our prayers must be offered up with a sense of our unworthiness. We have never rendered God any service, upon which we can base a claim to His favor. On the contrary, we have failed to meet His rightful demands upon us. His justice has a heavy claim against us, and we daily increase our debt. With what feelings, then, we should appear in the presence of the Divine Majesty, seeking blessings at His hands, is perfectly plain. Our petitions are acceptable only when they are offered with penitence and humility.

Similar feelings must accompany our alms. It is seldom that we are more strongly inclined to indulge in the spirit of the Pharisee, than in the practice of charity. But we dare not forget how unworthy we are to have any offering accepted at the hands of God. For what are we, that He should bless our poor gifts to the promotion of His glory, and that we should be the means, by our alms, of advancing His everlasting kingdom?

4. Our prayers must be attended with a feeling of our de-

pendence upon God. If we are self-confident, and rely upon our own energy and skill, for all that is needful for us, of what significance are our prayers? God is the Author and absolute Governor of all things, and the source of all blessings. Without His will we can neither procure nor enjoy any really good thing. He alone can grant us the desires of our hearts.

When we give alms, it must be in mindfulness of the fact, that we are His by creation, preservation, and redemption, and that He has a just claim upon our entire service and property. Our offerings are acceptable to Him, only when they are the humble recognition of His right to all that we have and are.

5. Our prayer must be presented in faith in Jesus Christ our Lord. No petition can be accepted, which does not rest upon the merit of our Saviour's atonement. It is true, pious persons prayed, and were heard previous to the advent of our Divine Mediator. David, Moses, and Elijah, prevailed in their supplications, and obtained heavenly benefits for themselves and others. But they accepted with a firm faith all the divine revelations, in as far as they had been imparted to them, and trusted God's promises in regard to the great Redeemer who was to come. Cornelius knew not of the incarnate Son of God. But, like Abraham, he believed in God's mercy and promises, and this faith was imputed to him for righteousness. The state of his mind and heart was such, that he was prepared at once by faith to embrace our Saviour, as soon as by the preaching of the gospel, He was presented to him. We must accept the revelation of God's mercy and love made to us in the person of His only-begotten Son, or our prayer will not be heard. "No man cometh to the Father except by me."

In giving alms, we must humbly trust that God, for Christ's sake, will own and bless them. "Whatsoever ye do, in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by Him." The merit which alone prevails in the sight of God, is that of Christ and of His gracious atonement. But Christ's Spirit is imparted to us, His righteousness becomes ours, and in so far as His life animates us, and His love glows within us, prompting us to do deeds of mercy, con-

descension, and love, they are pleasing to God, secure for us His favor, and go to make up our crown of everlasting rejoicing. They are "fruits unto holiness, of which the end is everlasting life."

On the tomb of Atolus, of Rheims, the following epitaph was inscribed: "He exported his fortune before him to heaven; he is gone thither to enjoy it." Here is a monument which beautifully hands down the record of his charity to future generations. From what we have learned in regard to Cornelius we, know how to secure a more enduring memorial; one which will stand before God throughout the ages of eternity.

ART. X.—THE PERSONALITY AND DIVINITY OF THE HOLY GHOST.

BY DANIEL GANS, D.D., NORRISTOWN, PA.

In a previous article, we endeavored to show, to some extent, the false faith and feeling which existed in regard to the Holy Spirit. Our object now is, to exhibit, in a brief way, the direct proof of His Personality and Divinity.

By personality, we understand such a union of reason and will, in one individual, as to constitute him an original and independent source of thought and action. The immediate result of this union of reason and will is self-consciousness, in which the individual intelligently apprehends himself in the unity of his being, so that, though standing organically in a general life, he yet knows and feels himself, at the same time, to be separate and distinct from all other beings.

By the personality of the Holy Ghost, we accordingly mean the union in Him of intelligence and will, whereby, although He possesses the same essence, and in this view is one with the Father and the Son, He has notwithstanding a distinct and separate being, to which belong personal and individual attributes. It is clear, however, that the Christian mind must be guarded

in regard to both sides of this subject. Personal distinction may easily be pressed too far, so as to make it interfere materially with the sameness of essence, which exists alike between the three persons of the Trinity, whilst, on the other hand, the identity may be readily pushed to such an extent as to rule out the conception of distinct personality altogether. In the Bible doctrine, both are equitably united, but the mode of the union involves a mystery which no finite mind can penetrate, so as clearly to understand the *how* or the relative measure in the case. It is a doctrine purely of Revelation, and therefore the appeal which it makes is to the faith and not the reason of men. God is one in three, and three in one. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost—three persons, and one God.

The mystery of the Spirit's Personality has entered into the faith of the Christian Church from the earliest ages of Christianity. We do not mean, by this remark, to say, that it was always apprehended, or even felt in the same deep and clear way. The historical evidence is, that at first it was comparatively but feebly grasped. As a great fact—as a self-existent and blessed reality, it was as fully and clearly revealed then as now; but in consequence of other doctrines, which at first seemed to press upon the Christian mind with superior, at least prior claims, especially the doctrine concerning the true divine and human personality of the Son, the attention of the Church was not called so directly and earnestly to this subject. It had its own point in time, as it had its own place in the system of grace itself, and before prior articles of faith were satisfactorily determined, this did not come up prominently. During the first three centuries, accordingly, but little comparatively was said or written in regard to it. Like every other doctrine of pure Revelation, received on the ground of faith, it required its own time to settle itself fairly and firmly in relation to other doctrines, in the Christian intuition, so that from thence, by its own vital energies, it might work itself up into the intelligent consciousness of the mind. In the organic structure of the Apostles' Creed, which we know was the result of a gradual pro-

cess, of a grand inward evolution of leading truth, from its own logical vitality, in the general mind of the Church, the doctrine of the Spirit's personality occupies its place, as a natural outgrowth, just as distinctly as any other fundamental doctrine, which, from its bosom, is made to challenge the faith of men. Just as the united Church was led to say, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; And in Jesus Christ His only begotten Son our Lord;" so did it come, in the way of gradual development of clear intuitional consciousness, also to say, "I believe in the Holy Ghost." That distinct and proper personality belongs to the Spirit, as really and truly as it does to the Father and the Son, was uniformly the firm and unwavering faith of the Church; but the inward perception of the doctrine, and the sense of its central significance, advanced with time, and in proportion as collateral facts arranged themselves in systematic order for faith. What are some of the more prominent Scripture proofs of this doctrine?

The manner in which the Holy Spirit is spoken of by Christ, is evidence of this fact, in itself of no insignificant character. The personal pronoun "He" is invariably used, when the object is to involve or set forth His proper being. Christ says, "I will pray the Father and He will give you another Comforter, that *He* may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth *Him* not, neither knoweth *Him:* but ye know *Him;* for *He* dwelleth with you, and shall be in you" (St. John xiv. 16, 17). The masculine pronoun is used, though the noun itself, Spirit, is neuter. "When *He*, the Spirit (ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα) is come, *He* will guide you," &c. (John xvi. 13). "That Holy Spirit of promise, *who* (ὅς) is the earnest of our inheritance," etc. (Eph. i. 14). The contrast between the masculine and neuter, according to the peculiar genius of the Greek language, gives a boldness to the conception of personality which is very striking. The neuter pronoun "it" would evidently be the proper word, instead of the masculine "He," "Who," "Him," if the Holy Ghost were a mere power, or attribute, or influence. "He" is the proper exponent of personality; and in its relation,

here to the Holy Ghost—a relation constituted by Christ Himself—it is the clear outward verbal sign of this fact in Him.

Personality, by the very conditions of its being, involves *intelligence.* Nothing can be personal, normally, that has not the power to know itself in itself, and as distinguished from everything else; and everything that does know itself in this way, is, in that fact, personal. In this fact, personality, according to its derivation—*personare*—meaning *to sound through*, proclaims not only its presence, but also its nature. The Holy Ghost has this intelligence. Speaking of the glorious things of the future state, which could not, by ordinary human ability, be understood, the Apostles says: "But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of men which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the spirit of God" (1 Cor. ii. 10, 11). Here it is not only proclaimed that the Holy Spirit possesses intelligence, but intelligence in the deepest sense and of the highest order—not only power to know, but to know and reveal also the profoundest mysteries. And the Holy Spirit, moreover, knows thus in and from Himself; for He is set forth, not as being passive, as though He were the medium merely of an intelligence beyond Himself, but as being active, as *searching* all things, even the deep things of God. Can this be true of a mere attribute, an influence, or a thing?

Thus one condition of personality, at least, is fairly and abundantly met in the Holy Ghost. He possesses knowledge to apprehend Himself as distinguished from the Father and all other personal and impersonal existences, and to search all these and reveal them in their most profound and hidden essences.

Does He also possess *will?* This fact is no less clearly affirmed. In regard to the various gifts of the Holy Ghost, the apostle says, "All these things worketh that one and self-same Spirit, dividing to every man *as He will*," *καθως βουλεται* (1 Cor. xii. 11). The second essential condition of personality is here found in the Holy Ghost, as fully and fairly as was the first.

It is not only taught here, in the plainest words, that He has a *will*, but also that His will involves the attribute of absolute sovereignty, one of the grandest attributes that inheres in the Divine Being. The word *βουλεται* is a strong word, and in this sentence is designedly, by position, brought out in its strongest form. It is not the will of another, but His own will. It is not ruled by that of another, but lies automically in His own conscious bosom, and is governed only by itself. Dividing to every man *as he will.*

Moreover, knowing and willing, in the high sense of these terms now indicated, are referred, in like manner, to the *self-same Spirit.* They are always regarded, by the sacred Scriptures, as being freely united, in the form of a mystery, entirely beyond the power of the human mind to understand, in one consciousness. From this mysterious union go forth all the operations and acts by which He is outwardly distinguished from the Father and the Son. Thus it is said that He teaches, leads and comforts; that He quickens, designates to office, and sends forth apostles; that He convicts the world of sin, of righteousness, and of a judgment to come; and that He bears witness with the spirits of the saints, and makes intercession for them with groanings which cannot be uttered (St. Luke xii. 12. St. John xvi. 7, 13; vi. 63. Acts. xii. 2, 4. Rom. viii. 16, 26). It is said also that he reveals things to come. All prophecy, both in the Old and New Testaments, arises from the mysterious movings of the Holy Ghost, involving this hidden union of infinite intelligence and sovereign will, in a common consciousness, through and over the human mind. "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Peter i. 21).

In all this it is impossible not to see a personal being, comprehending intelligence and will in mysterious and real union. To refer these activities, or their results, to a mere impersonal influence, or virtue, would be at once to destroy their significance altogether. To teach, to guide, to quicken, to comfort, to convict, to witness, to intercede, and to reveal things which were buried in the future, which were concealed by an impene-

trable veil from the ordinary mind, are manifestly not the acts of a thing, but of a person endowed with all the deepest and grandest elements of personality.

But the Holy Ghost is not simply a person: He is a *Divine* Person. We have anticipated this already to some extent, both in the basis of personality philosophically viewed, as holding in the sameness of essence with the Father and the Son, and also in the Scripture quotations, which we have brought to bear upon the subject. Indeed, such is the form of the subject of the Spirit's personality in itself considered, that the mind cannot, in its own reflections, think of it as dissociated from Divinity; and much less is it possible to find the Scriptures ever viewing them separately or as standing apart. Although the bare fact of personality does not of itself involve Divinity, yet, in the case of the Holy Ghost, these two things are always united, and necessarily so. They are seen together in all the texts bearing directly upon the general subject. What proves the one necessarily involves the other. Every Scripture proof of personality in His case, is a proof, at the same time, and with the same force also, of His divinity; for if He be personal at all, His personality must stand in the same essence that distinguishes the nature of the Father and the Son; just as the personality of the individual human being, to be real and true, must arise in the bosom of a human nature broader than his own, and which is common alike to all men.

The knowledge of the Spirit, as we have already seen, is Divine knowledge; His will is a sovereign, and consequently, a creative will (implying a sense of the word in this connection altogether beyond every application of it to the human will, in any of its conditions, as in the case of kings, princes, &c.,); and all the acts which go forth from the union of these carry in them supernatural wisdom and power. In a word, every part of Revelation makes the distinction of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, as this is heralded by his personality, to grow out of His inward unity or identity with them, as this lies in the absolute sameness of Divine essence.

On this account the Divinity of the Spirit is always directly

connected, in the view of Scripture, with His personality. It is so connected, also, by an inward necessity, in the deeper reflections of the human mind. Things that have always been, especially in the case of the creative mind, will invariably find a shadow of themselves in the deeper consciousness of man. Rational nature was made to reflect, in some true and intelligent sense, the mysterious being of God. In this deepest sense, God has never left Himself without a witness. Hence it is that reason cannot get along at all with this elevated subject, except as by the aid of faith it suffers itself to be led to the true form of God's being, as this holds in unity of essence and trinity of personality. To think of the Holy Ghost as a true person, without the Divine essence, is at once to deny the deepest law of human thought and Revelation together, and to make shipwreck of all that is great and grand in Christianity, both for the present and the future. This is the effect of philosophy falsely so-called.

The Divinity of the Holy Ghost, besides the general presumption of the fact which underlies all the Scriptures, is specifically and fully proven. This is done, first, by the *names* which the inspired Record applies to Him.

These are divine names, and can only be applied to a Divine Person. St. Paul, Acts xxviii. 25, speaking to those who believed not, says: "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive." If we now turn to this passage, recorded in Isaiah vi. 3, 8, 9, we find that it is spoken by the Lord (Jehovah), whilst Paul here attributes it to the Holy Ghost. The necessary inference to be drawn from the apparent contradiction is, that the Holy Ghost is God. This same form of proof is found in Acts v. 3, 4. "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the *Holy Ghost*, and to keep back a part of the price of the land? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto *men*, but unto *God*." The bodies of Christians are called the temple of God and of the Holy Ghost indiscriminately. "The temple of *God* is holy, which temple ye are" (1 Cor. iii. 17); and in 1 Cor.

vi. 19, the question is asked, "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the *Holy Ghost?*" In these, and all other similar passages, the Holy Spirit is plainly called *God;* and we cannot escape the inference that, as to the nature of His being, He *is* God.

The manner in which these names are interchanged—used now for one person, and then for another, is an additional evidence of the Divinity of the Spirit's personality. This indiscriminate application of the name God to the Father and the Holy Ghost, is made in the entire absence, so far as the human mind can see, of premeditation or design. All is free and perfectly natural. It is truth itself in its eternal character projecting its own form by its own action, thus revealing to the eye of man, the inward and hidden identity of essence between the Father and the Holy Ghost. The whole fact of this essential union between them is assumed in the Sacred Scriptures, and the outward expressions of it, are but the simple, natural, necessary results from what is thus presupposed, as the leading, formative fact itself.

Divine Attributes and Perfections are also ascribed to the Holy Ghost. He is called *Eternal.* "For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the *Eternal Spirit* offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" (Heb. ix. 13, 14). Eternity is only appropriate to Jehovah.

He is also described as *omniscient.* We have already refered to a text bearing directly on this point, 1 Cor. ii. 10. *Το γαρ πνευμα παντα ερευνα, και τα βαθα του Θεου.* To search *all*—to penetrate and know all, *even the hidden depths of God,* is an attribute which certainly does not belong to any created and consequently limited and finite mind, much less impersonal thing. The power to tell the future separates the Holy Spirit no less really from all mere human intelligence. Human personalities may indeed be elevated into the high regions of vision, but they can never raise themselves to this height. The future

is a boundary line which forbids the boldest human tread. The prophets of the Old and New Testaments in crossing this line, were all led by the Holy Ghost. Paul was *caught up*. Personal Divinity, constituting the fountain of prophetic power, did not lie in them, but lay in the Spirit who entered and thus carried them temporarily beyond their legitimate and normal state. It is only thus that they saw and then painted what was to be.

The Holy Spirit is called *Almighty*. In Eph. i. 19, the apostle speaks of the "working of his mighty power;" and in Rom. xv. 18, 19, he describes the "mighty signs and wonders," through which Christ had enabled him to make the Gentiles obedient, "by the power of the Spirit of God." Thus he is given as the source of miracles. Others also performed miracles, but just as others also prophesied, not *of* or *from* themselves, but only as power was given to them by a Divine Person. In the case of the Holy Ghost, this "mighty power" is in and from Himself.

He is no less *Omnipresent*. We infer this from the fact already stated in 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17, that He dwells in the bodies of all the saints, however widely these may be scattered over space, as in a temple. The statement of this fact is still stronger and more impressive in the 139th Psalm: "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?" There is no space beyond Him.

But Divine works are ascribed to the Holy Ghost, as well as divine essence, names and attributes. He is represented as having been essentially connected with the natural creation. "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters" (Gen. i. 2). The Psalmist explains this, where he says, "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the hosts of them by the breath (spirit) of his mouth" (Ps. xxxiii. 6). And again he says, "Thou sendest forth the Spirit, and they are created" (Ps. civ. 30).

In the new spiritual creation the Holy Spirit is, if possible, still more vitally the essential principle. Our Lord was conceived by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary. Whosoever is truly born again, is "born of the Spirit" (St.

John iii. 8); of "water and the Spirit" (vs. 5, 6); "by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Tit. iii. 5; 2 Cor. iii. 3, 6; 2 Thess. ii. 13).

The resurrection of the body from the dead is no less directly ascribed to the power of the Holy Ghost. "If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is alive because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you" (Rom. viii. 10, 11).

To the Holy Ghost, finally, are awarded divine honors. This is seen in the earnest importunity expressed in the frequent exhortations not to *grieve* Him (Eph. iv. 3), not to quench his influences (1 Thess. v. 19). His dignity rises with the essential importance of His work, and His honor with His dignity. The same award of divine honor is implied in all the solemn warnings in reference to sins that may be committed against Him. In this view the dignity assigned Him is peculiarly high and sacred. The sin of blasphemy, though it may be forgiven as committed against the Son, or even the Father, can, as committed against the Holy Ghost, not be forgiven, either in this or the future world (Matt. xv. 31, 32. Acts v. 3, 5).

In Holy Baptism He is honored equally with the Father and the Son (Matt. xxviii. 19;) and in the Benediction, the three persons stand upon the same plane of honor (2 Cor. xiii. 14). Equality of honor is expressed, moreover, in the threefold adoration of the veiled seraphim, "Holy, holy, holy" (Is. vi. 3). Angels worship the Spirit, even as they adore and magnify the Father and the Son.

Now combining all these different forms of proof, and observing closely the full force that lies in each, it is certainly difficult to see how it is possible for the human mind to withhold its free and full assent to the true Personal Divinity of the Holy Ghost. Certain it is that unbelief here, is more difficult to maintain on rational ground, than faith; for reason and faith in this case, as on all other points of clear revelation, stand together on the same side.

The form of the relation of faith to the Holy Ghost, is a subject of serious significance. However profound the mystery of the Spirit's constitution, it is yet made clearly to confront man upon the plainest and most rational ground, in such a way, indeed, that he must find it impossible to ignore it, without ignoring at the same time, not only his deepest intuitions (which are but the projected beams of divine truth in his deeper consciousness), but also his highest reason. Reason and Faith are not, in their own nature, repellants, but rest together freely in the same consciousness, where this consciousness is in its full and normal state, and is properly awake to the two worlds, the natural and the spiritual, the sense of which it comprehends. They demand and require each other, just as the body requires and demands the soul, and the soul the body. As the Trinity of the Divine Being in Unity of Essence, is itself the most vital of all facts, and is at the same time the profoundest and most inscrutable of all mysteries, so each of the Divine Persons, coming forth distinctly from this central mystery, must, by the rational necessity of the case, come in the bosom more or less of the same mystery. To deny it thus in its issue, is to deny it in the primary conception of Trinity; and this is the same as to ignore altogether the idea of God Himself; for in no other form is God revealed to the mind of man.

How, otherwise, is it possible, besides, to be at all truly related to the substantive nature of Christianity, since this, from the beginning to the end of the New Testament, is made to lie as it were in the bosom of the Holy Ghost? He was given, not in order that He Himself might be Christianity, but in order that He might penetrate the real elements of it already at hand, vitalize and organize them by His own inherent presence, and thus constitute the ever-present womb of the new birth in the world and among men. Therefore is the Church called the Home of the Spirit, and therefore is the present called the Dispensation of the Spirit. This does not exclude the presence of Christ, but is, on the other hand, the only form in which that presence can be conceived as actually holding. He is ever-present in the Holy Ghost. It is the office of the

Spirit, not only thus to organize and permeate the Church as the glorified yet substantive divine-human body of Christ, but also continually, through the ordinances of this mystical real body, to mediate between Christ and those who are members of it by faith. Thus He perpetually takes of the things of Christ, and shows them unto us.

To deny Divine Personality in the Holy Ghost would, it is clear, be as fatal to the whole conception of real substantive Christianity, as it possibly could be in the case of the Holy Trinity. Neither could be held with any show of reason. Three in One, and One in Three, is the grand prototyphal formula, constituting the true ground of reason and faith alike. By its own plastic power has it entered and given form to the whole constitution of nature and mind; hence it is that the whole of our mundane being carries in it, at every point, an unconscious prophecy of this primal fact.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A Reply *to the Rev. Dr. George Junkin's Treatise, entitled "Sabbatismos."* By *Justin Martyr.* Philadelphia: T. Ellwood Zell, Publisher, 17 and 19 South Sixth Street. Pp. 143.

The title indicates the object of this work. The book of Dr. Junkin, to which it undertakes to reply, is acknowledgedly a work of considerable ability. It presents a forcible argument from its own standpoint, in favor of the position it advocates. There is, however, one feature about it, incident to almost all divines whose theological thinking is formed after the Scotch mould, which exposes it to attack with considerable plausibility. The writer of the present Reply has taken advantage of this, and directed the main force of his argument against it.

The vulnerable feature to which we refer in Dr. Junkin's argument, is the direct effort made to prove, that the Christian Sabbath is the legitimate transfer of the Jewish Sabbath over into the Christian dispensation, and hence, carries with it the leading characteristics and sanctions of the Mosaic institution. This view of the Christian Sab-

bath was rejected by the early Reformers; and from their writings bearing upon this particular point, "Justin Martyr," in his "Reply," quotes freely with an air of affected triumph. Great injustice, however, is done these ancient worthies, when they are represented as denying the obligation to observe the Christian Sabbath, whilst they only reject the view, which derives its sanctions, mainly or solely from the assumption, that it is a continuance of the Jewish institution. Their teachings, fairly interpreted, as well as their practice, were all against the view favored by the author of the "Reply," that the Christian Sabbath carries with it no divine sanctions as a religious institution.

The true line of argument for the religious observance of the Christian Sabbath, which is irresistible, and which the author of the "Reply" has not ventured to combat, is that which is founded upon the nature of things. The fact that the Jewish Sabbath is incorporated in the Decalogue, furnishes, it is true, confirmatory testimony to the divine character of the Christian Sabbath, but it does not constitute the primary or fundamental argument in its favor. Indeed, the command to observe the Sabbath, as well as the remaining precepts in the Decalogue, finds expression there, because it is founded in nature. In other words, the precepts of the Decalogue do not receive their moral character from the fact, that they are incorporated in the divine code; but they are placed there, because they already possess this character. The question, then, in regard to the duty of appropriating the one-seventh portion of our time to exclusively religious observances, does truly resolve itself into one of morals. And if this be so, according to "Justin Martyr's" own admission in the preface to his book, there is an end to the discussion. The only question that remains to be settled, then, concerns the character of the sanctions, with which its proper observance is to be enforced. These, of course, must correspond with the nature and importance of the object to be secured. This aspect of the case, it is very plain, must prove fatal to the wishes of "Justin Martyr" and his friends, with regard to obtaining legal sanction for running the cars on the city railroads on Sunday.

Our limits will not allow us to pursue the argument any further. The positions of the "Reply," though plausible, are not tenable. If they be allowed, they must result in the obliteration of the Christian Sabbath as a religious institution. No one, certainly, who has any regard for the morals of the community, is prepared for such an issue.

F.

History of the Christian Church. By *Philip Schaff, D.D.*, Vol. II. and vol. III. From Constantine the Great to Gregory the Great, A. D., 311–600. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., No. 654 Broadway, 1867.

Thus has the laborious author brought down his history of the Church to the year A. D., 600. Though six miles of the way laid

back still seems comparatively little when there are in all eighteen miles to travel, yet, in Church History, as in other things, the words hold true: "All beginnings are difficult." The first six centuries cover that period of the history of the Church, which demands for its true representation peculiar patience, labor, and learning; and we congratulate Dr. Schaff on his success thus far. The middle ages, though it looks like a wilderness, will yet present fewer real difficulties to his progress. The Reformation and post-reformation period will present again a heavy and toilsome part of the journey, but it will have the comfort of being the last; and besides, it opens to the historian a field for usefulness and honor above all the preceding periods. A general history of this age of the Church, comprehensive, truly objective, and faithful, is a work yet to be accomplished, and when Dr. Schaff has carried his history safely and successfully through it, he may regard the work of his life as gloriously crowned.

The appearance of these goodly volumes together shows that the work is being carried forward with vigor. The Germans hardly ever finish any thing. In many cases the Introductory volume is all we possess of some great work which was to be. If they do happen to get over the whole subject, they do not let it remain finished, but overturn the whole by new successive editions, which must be bought and studied anew to see how the good man can demolish himself. Perhaps we ought to be thankful that these German Theologians and historians are thus ever learning, and ever ready to teach us what they have learned; but in America we want things finished. Dr. Schaff is an American, and, according to the fashion of our country, his books are stereotyped; he must, therefore, leave them alone, and, forgetting the things that are behind, press forward to those that are before. Being still in the prime of life, and having for more than a score of years travelled familiarly over the history of the Church in his Seminary lectures, he will "make haste," though it be "slowly," toward his journey's end; and thus, through him our own new world will give to letters what is so much needed—a history of the whole Church. Glad are we, therefore, to hear Dr. Schaff say in the Preface: "It is my wish and purpose to resume this work as soon as other engagements will permit, and to complete it according to the original plan."

The first of these volumes, being vol. II., sets forth more particularly the more outward fortunes, circumstances, and progress of the Church during the period from A. D. 311 to 590—the victory of Christianity, over heathenism, the alliance of Church and State, Monasticism, polity, discipline and schism, worship, customs, sacraments and ceremonies. In this way is the reader familiarized with the general spirit and life of the period, and prepared to appreciate the more particularly dogmatic history which follows.

The third volume, after about fifty pages on the history of Christian Art, takes up the Trinitarian, Christological, and Anthropological controversies, to which by far the greater part of the volume is devoted.

The organization, classification, and general grouping of all the various phases and tendencies included in this very important period is admirably managed. The reader is carried through all the intricacies of that highly controversial age with intelligible and regular progress. Dr. Schaff has a special talent and facility for stating difficult opposing views in controversy. This, in the case of the long and varied Trinitarian controversies, where it is so peculiarly difficult, he has done with great clearness. His success in this particular respect is owing to the manner, in which he seizes upon the main features of the matter in debate, briefly subordinates all elements of secondary importance, and by strict attention to symmetry, keeps the whole age with all its controlling forces moving forward before us. He, very correctly, ever finds the main current of the Christian life culminating in the dogma, and then ever again makes the dogma in its turn the ruling force of the new advancing life of the Church. Hence, his Book is emphatically a history of the *life*, not of the *death* of the Church—a history of Christ's kingdom, not of the devil's triumphs—a history where truth and not error is master. He makes prominent the living tree, with its green leaves, blooming flowers, and gladdening fruit, and does not spend most of his time on the loathsome worms at the root, the dry rot here and there upon the bark, the occasional dead limbs with the croaking raven, who would fain make believe that his own dry and rotting branch is the entire kingdom, and that with its own downfall the tree of life itself would perish. Those who believe, that, even in the first six centuries, the history of the Church changed to become the history of the devil, need not look for comfort to their theory into these volumes; though we advise them most earnestly to read here in order to have the bad scales removed from their bleared vision.

The last 150 pages of this volume is taken up with sketches of the Church fathers, Greek and Latin, whose lives and activities fall in this period. Into these brief but comprehensive sketches, the author interweaves, not only the main facts of their lives, but also the literature of the age, as created and represented by these ruling personalities. We like this feature of the work.

This history by Dr. Schaff has many decided merits. The matter is condensed, so as to bring the whole story within a reasonable compass, and yet, the narrative is so managed as not to sink into dry detail. The style is clear and flowing, and animated by the spirit of devotion and edification. Its admirable grouping of events makes it an excellent text-book for our seminaries, while its clear style and animated narrative will always render it attractive to the general reader.

Under the several headings the authorities and the literature pertaining to the subject, are extensively given, which facilitates reference to any one wishing to pursue the matter more extensively. The foot-notes furnish abundant quotations from authorities with critical remarks.

The work is well gotten up by Mr. Scribner's enterprising publish-

ing house. The letter-press is goodly to the eye, and the paper white and clean. We are glad to see such a general agreement among the journals of the land in regard to the decided merits of this work. It takes its place at once as a standard American Church History.

THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS; or, Scriptural Views of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. By *John S. Stone, D.D.* Griswold Lectures in the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 770 Broadway. 1866. Pp. 631.

This, to use the Author's words in the Preface, is to be regarded as "an improved, rather than an altered edition," of a work published in 1844 under the general title, "The Mysteries Opened." This first edition has been in our library for twenty years. The present revised edition is vastly improved in the style of getting up. The paper is white, the type large, and the page beautiful to the eye. How glad would we be, if we could add that its contents delight us in the same way. The author's views have passed through twenty years substantially unchanged. We had marked, in reading, many passages; but it is not necessary to quote them. The author's theory is plain. In regenerating and purifying the soul, "truth is the instrument, and the only instrument," which the Spirit uses. The sacraments are preaching symbols. Baptism is a "badge," a "symbol," a "moral monument." It is a sign of what *has been* received, and a pledge of what *shall be* bestowed; but has no present efficacy, except as the symbol of a great truth which it teaches. The Holy Supper is "love's memorial," "faith's mirror," a "means of grace," but only as it reflects truth upon the mind, a "test of obedience," a "visible badge," a "moral monument." This is a brief, but fair exhibit of the substantial theory of the book. In a clear and forcible style, the author maintains this baldest of theories found fairly in no symbols either of Ancient, Roman, or Protestant Christianity. It is consistently at home only among Socinians, Unitarians, and Rationalists. The book amazes us, and makes us sad.

For sale by Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD. By *Rev. George L. Mott.* New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 770 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 230.

The author's design in this work is to furnish a popular treatise on the resurrection. "It is not written for theologians, but for intelligent Christian readers, whose minds may need instruction on this much-neglected subject." We can heartily recommend the work as adapted to the end it proposes to itself. It has a good scriptural, theological, and psychological substructure, bears evident marks of study and care is besides, earnest, clear, concise, and animated with a devout spirit.

For sale by Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia.

THE GOSPELS: with Moral Reflections on each verse. By *Pasquier Quesnel.* With an Introductory Essay by Rev. Daniel Wilson, D.D., Vicar of Islington, now Bishop of Calcutta. Revised by the Rev. Henry A. Boardman, D.D. In two volumes. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 770 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 648 and 646.

We are glad to see this memorable work appear in an English dress, and especially so beautifully done up. It is a gem in the book-making line. The story of Quesnel is well known,—a French Roman Catholic divine with, at one time of his life at least, and in some aspects of his mind, a certain Protestantizing tendency. Born in 1634, he finished his theological studies at the Sarbonne in Paris in 1657, and in the twenty-eighth year of his age, was placed at the head of that institution. This position furnished him occasion to write his "Moral Reflections," which at first covered only the words of Christ, but which he afterwards extended over the whole of the Gospels, and finally also through the Epistles. The Reflections on the Gospels were first published in 1671, and soon passed through several editions, and were also in 1694 translated into Latin. The work gave rise to extensive controversies, and brought sadness and trouble upon their author. He had to flee his country, but found refuge in Holland, where, notwithstanding the famous Bull *Unigenitus*, &c., issued 1713, condemned 101 heresies in his book, he quietly lived and died in the Roman Church, contending to the last, that he never intended to teach in his book any thing in opposition to his Church. These facts in themselves are calculated to give to this work of his a peculiar interest. But it has, besides, an intrinsic worth and charm—full of originality, suggestive, and genial devotional thoughts.

The reader must, however, be informed, that he has not here the full and pure work of Quesnel. If the Pope's Bull condemned it on the one side, its English and American editors have taken the same liberty on the other side. Dr. Boardman tells us in his Preface, that "certain Romish errors * * disfigure more or less the original edition of his notes. A large portion of the obnoxious passages were *omitted* in the English edition of the work; but a careful revision has brought to light a considerable number which had been overlooked. These have been expunged. To this point, indeed, the editor's task has been chiefly restricted—the cancelling of Romish errors—which would have impeded the circulation of the volumes and limited their usefulness." The work may thus be regarded as now thoroughly Protestant. But the more this may have been necessary to make the book safe and saleable, the more, we cannot help but think, is the pity for poor Quesnel! Condemned by the Pope while he was still living, and now twice expurgated when he is dead, his work is to be fathered—by whom? We would prefer to see the fact of its being an expurgated edition stated distinctly on the title page. Our own first preference would be to have the genuine work of Quesnel; the editors might have added their objections to particular passages in notes. Yet as it is, the work is

very valuable as bringing out with peculiar unction the deep things of the Gospel, and its reading suggests not only many happy thoughts, but also awakens genuine religious affections. We thank the editors and publishers for thus much of Quesnel, and agree with Dr. Wilson, when he says: "We have nothing in practical divinity so sweet, so spiritual, so interior as to the real life of grace, so rich, so copious, so original."

For sale by Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia.

THE LIFE OF THE REV. ROBERT BAIRD, D.D. By his son, *Henry M. Baird*, Professor in the University of the city of New York. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 770 Broadway. 1866. Pp. 347.

Dr. Baird, from 1830 forward to his death in 1863, filled a large space in the public mind. He was successively connected with various general Protestant associations and societies, such as Sunday Schools, Missions, Temperance, Foreign Evangelical Society, Christian Union, Evangelical Alliance, Southern Aid Society, &c., &c. In these interests he travelled over almost all the countries of Europe, and often stood before and dined with kings and other dignitaries, and enjoyed much of their confidence, and received frequent marks of their favor. The story of his life is well told, and is suggestive to the thoughtful in many ways besides those indicated in the volume. A fine portrait faces the title-page.

For sale by Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia.

THE CHRIST OF THE APOSTLE'S CREED: the Voice of the Church against Arianism, Strauss and Renan, with an Appendix. By *Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D.*, Pastor of the 42d Street Presbyterian Church. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 770 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 432.

This work furnishes us a series of lectures on that part of the Apostles' Creed which relates to Christ, originally delivered by the author to his congregation. The lectures are devoted to setting forth the established views of the Person of Christ, and their defence against those heresies, which occasioned their original symbolic statement in the Creed. Notice is also taken of the more modern Socinian and Unitarian views. The discussion of the still later anti-christological schemes of Strauss and Renan does not seem to have formed a part of the author's original plan, as these are brought forward only in the Appendix, where we are briefly presented with some facts and views in regard to these latest assaults on the person of Christ. Owing to the fact, that these lectures were prepared for public audiences, they are, in their character, necessarily rather popular than scientific. The author rejects the article: "He descended into Hell," and devotes two chapters to show that this dogma has no authority in primitive antiquity, nor any basis whatever in the sacred Scriptures! Dr. Scott writes boldly, forcibly, and clearly, and the publishers have gotten out his work in excellent style.

For sale by Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia.

THE SHADOW OF THE ROCK, and other Poems. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph No. 770 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 224.

This is a gem of a volume—beautifully gotten up, and excellent in its contents. It is a selection of poems, truly Christian in spirit, from various sources.

For sale by Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia.

PASTOR'S REGISTER FOR PRIVATE USE. Arranged by *Rev. W. T. Beatty.* Second Edition. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 770 Broadway. 1867.

This is a book of good white writing paper, with headings printed, adapted for a pastor's private register. It has several departments. First, for sermons: when preached, where preached, occasion, remarks, &c. Also a Register of Baptisms, well arranged, of Marriages, Funerals, Communicants received, Pastoral visits made, Miscellaneous Addresses. For the Reformed Church it lacks a division for Confirmations; but this may easily be brought under the head of communicants received. The whole idea is a good one, and we know nothing of this kind more useful or better adapted to the wants of all young pastors just beginning their ministry. It is just what they need.

For sale by Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia.

STUDIES IN THE GOSPELS. By *Richard Chenevix Trench, D.D.*, Archbishop of Dublin. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867. Pp. 326.

Those who are acquainted with this author's works on the Miracles, the Parables, &c., need no recommendation of these "Studies in the Gospels." This work is of like character as to value, and will at once take its place as a standard. The author seizes on leading features in the life of Christ, and on prominent characters which appear in the Gospel history, and gives them learned and thorough treatment. We have in all, sixteen subjects treated, among which are the Temptation, the Transfiguration, the Penitent Malefactor, Christ and the Samaritan Woman, Zaccheus, the True Vine, the Sons of Thunder, &c. Dr. Trench is thoroughly at home in German learning, and knows how to use it for the cause of truth. This gives a solidity and value to his works, which causes them to be eagerly sought after and highly prized by earnest men.

HOMILETICS AND PASTORAL THEOLOGY. By *William G. T. Shedd, D.D.* New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 429,

"Most of the materials of this treatise," the Preface informs us, "were originally composed, in the form of lectures, in the years 1852 and 1853, when the author held the Professorship of Sacred Rhetoric and Pastoral Theology in Auburn Theological Seminary." These lectures are written with evident earnestness, and give signs of being the

fruit of much study. The greater part of the volume is taken up with Homiletical subjects proper, and much of this is devoted to Sacred Rhetoric, to which the author has given much study. Pastoral Theology receives briefer discussion. Liturgies and Catechetics have each only a single chapter devoted to it, and these are the least satisfactory parts of the volume. For this there is, however, the reason that these are not primary or prominent interests in the denomination in which the author labors. It was not designed that the work should be a scientific treatise on Practical Theology, or any part of it, and hence it, of course, lacks the full, well rounded, symmetrical character of a scientific system. The work is written in Dr. Shedd's clear style, and is variously enriched with useful matter from his well-stored mind.

POPULAR LITERATURE.

The following works, new religious stories, designed for family reading and Sunday School libraries, are all published by J. P. Skelly & Co., 732 Chestnut street. Philadelphia: 1867.

I. John Hatherton. By the author of "Effie's Friend." pp. 192.

This begins as a pleasant story of love in humble life, which is soon consummated in marriage. Then the life of the happy couple grows earnest and solidly pious. Severe trials, amid poverty and sickness ensue, all of which is made, not only tolerable, but sweetly remedial and sanctifying, till it ends with "the smile after the tear." The story has merit and a good moral.

II. Brook Silvertone. A story for children. By *Emma Marshall.* pp. 171.

This is a very pleasant story, well managed. It shows how a rude and worldly aunt made a very moody girl of a niece, who was under her care, and how both were brought to better ways and manners under the influence of an intelligent neighbor lady. Also what the little "Brook Silvertone" said to the moody little girl as it rippled and sung near her door. We can commend this book.

III. The Story of a Red Velvet Bible. By *M. H.* pp. 108.

This book we do not like. It gets the Red Velvet Bible into a Family, where it produces effects in a way so fantastic, that one is reminded of the havoc produced by the ark in the temple of Dagon. From all that appears, M. H. finds little need of either Church or sacraments in his (or her?) scheme of the Christian religion.

IV. Sam Bolton's Cottage, and what Kept His Wife from Church. By the author of the "Dove on the Cross." pp. 198.

A good story. Bolton and his young wife begin right in life as good Church members. Gradually as their family expenses increase,

it becomes necessary for his wife to wear less expensive dresses than she did before she was married, a thing which she finds it difficult to do with grace. A foolish pride keeps her from attending church and the holy communion for years. Her husband is more sensible, and, by gentleness, aided by some disciplinary providences, he works an effectual change in her views and ways. The book points wholesome morals, and furnishes good lessons of life.

Space forbids us to give little more than the titles of the rest, with the number of pages. All from the above publisher.

V. A CHILD'S WARFARE; or the Conquest of Self. By *Madeline E. Hewer.* pp. 313.

VI. MILLICENT LEIGH; a Tale. By *Emma Marshall.* pp. 319. The story is good, and the contents healthful in their tone.

VII. THE LITTLE DOORKEEPER; or Patience and Peace. By *S. T. C.*, author of "Maggie and Wattie," "The Little Fox," &c. pp. 231.

This story clusters around a church: teaches love to the church, and has in it much good filial sentiment.

VIII. BUT ONCE. By the author of "Let Well Alone." pp. 255.

X. THE LOST LILIES. A story for children. By *Emma Marshall.* pp. 108.

This is a touching story with a good moral, and may well go into any Sunday School library.

X. LET WELL ALONE. By the author of "The Widow's Son," "But Once," "The Brothers," etc. pp. 258.

All these books, from the house of J. P. Skelly & Co., are well gotten up. The paper is good, the binding very neat, and the illustrations fine.

THE THEOLOGICAL ECLECTIC. A Repertory chiefly of foreign theological literature. Bi-monthly, New York: Edited by *George E. Day, D. D.* Vol. IV., No. 5.

A good number. Contents: Rev. F. W. Robertson.—What Gospel did he Preach. The Military Metaphors of St. Paul. Spurgeon as a Preacher. Origin and Significance of Bible Names. Luther's Theology. $3 per year in advance.

NOTE.—Some Publications from the House of J. P. Skelly & Co., must lay over for notice in our next number.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1867.

Art. I.—COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS. July 25, 1867.

BY J. W. NEVIN, D. D., PRESIDENT OF FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA.

I. TO THE GRADUATING CLASS.

Young Gentlemen:—Just fourteen years have elapsed since I stood in this place to speak my parting words to the last Senior Class of the old Marshall College, which was at the same time the first Senior Class of the new consolidated institution, into which the old college had become merged in this place. That solemn public act closed, as I then thought finally, the relation in which I had stood to the college as its President through previous years; and in view of this fact, it seemed proper to make my farewell to the graduating class a sort of general farewell to all who had ever been under my care as students. The Baccalaureate became in this way an oration to the Alumni. A desire has been expressed from different quarters, that the resumption of my old office should be marked on this occasion by a similar comprehension or gathering up of the past in the present; and you will not therefore take it amiss, if my address to you now, as the first graduating class under my new term of service, be so widened and enlarged in its

scope as to take the form of a fatherly address to all who have gone forth from the institution, whether actually present here to-day or not—both the older generation of students from the classic shades of Mercersburg, and the later succession that has been added to these veteran ranks from the halls of Franklin and Marshall here in Lancaster. Into this general brotherhood, this goodly fellowship of kindred academic life, you have been solemnly ushered by the honors of this Commencement Day. I see you before me now as part of the great family which has thus received you in its bosom; and, as the organ of your common *alma mater*, what I have to say to you farther, at the present time, I say to all.

II. TO THE ALUMNI IN GENERAL.

To you then, Sons of the College at large, the representatives of its life through thirty years, I now turn my address. In doing so, however, the old familiar compellation of the baccalaureate falls helpless to the ground. I can no longer address you as *Young Gentlemen*. Most of you at least have outgrown that title. It will no longer fit especially the students of Mercersburg. In my mind's eye, indeed, they are still young; and I seem to renew the vigor of my own life, when I call to remembrance the youthful forms, replete with the generous spirit of youth, in which they passed before me, with daily familiar intercourse, in former years. Need I say, my beloved Pupils, that it is an easy illusion with me, in the midst of such retrospective contemplation, to think of you still as "boys," and thus almost to forget the present in the past? I doubt not but that at times you are yourselves borne away by the power of the same illusion; and that amid the festivities in particular of your present Alumni Reunion, you have been tempted to look upon it as not only your privilege, but your right, to be boys again in the fullest and best sense of the term. But the fancy is too bold; and it is best that we keep it, you and I, to our own hearts. You are no longer boys; allow me to say it in all seriousness, you are no longer even *young* gentlemen, in the proper acceptation of the address. It

would sound ludicrous to this audience, not knowing you as I do, to hear you characterized by any such title. My own eyes as I gaze upon you, correct with rude shock the fond hallucination of my feelings in regard to the point. You are not yet any of you old men, properly speaking; but you are all fast becoming old; and it will require only a few years—years that will pass, O, how quickly—to advance you all to the gray-haired dignity of fathers, in the generation which has heretofore known you only as sons. I say this primarily of the old Mercersburg students. But the first classes of Lancaster are, of course, pressing hard after them, in the same career of age; and all of you together know, that the dreams of youth are forever behind you, that the stern realities of life are around you, that its responsible burdens are full upon you, and that what lies before you is no longer play nor preparation, but the long, laborious work of earnest and full-grown men.

I do not address you to-day then as young men. It is not right that either you or I should forget, or try to forget, the course of time in which we are solemnly involved. The present occasion, rightly improved, cannot fail to bring home to us the fact that we are getting old; and to remind us how far we have come and where we now stand, in the great world movement to which we belong. Rightly improved, however, it cannot fail also to rejuvenate and freshen the sense of the present by the wholesome recollection of the past. I would not have you forget your college days. You have no wish yourselves to forget them. I would not have you forget that you were once boys. There is a natural piety, here, as Wordsworth terms it, which should ever bind our manhood to our childhood and boyhood, our later to our earlier life; and without which, we have full reason to say, our later life can never be either solid or sound. The boy is in a profound sense father to the man; and the vigor of a true man, be well assured, on even to green old age, depends largely on the power he has to carry along with him the spirit of his boyhood to the last. Cherish in such view the memories that are made to crowd upon you on this anniversary occasion. Give room to your youthful feelings. They cannot

make you young again, in the old outward way in which you were once young. But they may help at least to keep you young at heart; which is something far better; better for yourselves, and better also for the world in which you are called to work.

A retrospective view of life is in any circumstances interesting and instructive. But it becomes especially so, where the period it overlooks is found to be of great public significance, added to the meaning it may have for ourselves separately considered. In such view, let me refer again to the interval which has passed since my last address to the graduates of Marshall College spoken from this place in 1853. As a period simply of fourteen years, it may not seem to amount to much in the general chronology of the world; whatever serious changes we may feel it to have brought with it for each one of us, in our own persons and in our immediate personal surroundings. But look at these fourteen years again, in what they have brought to pass for this nation, and for the history of the world, and tell me what language is sufficient to express properly their momentous import. The distance which separates us to-day from the first Commencement of Franklin and Marshall College in 1853, is but feebly represented by any such brief chronological measure as this. It is a period, in which, as we look back upon it, days seem to lose their ordinary sense, and the flight of weeks is turned into the flight of years. It is more for each one of us immeasurably, than the simple change it has wrought in our own age. In the general movement of the world, we have lived scores, I had almost said centuries of years, in passing through it. For the life of the world, as we know, does not run forward with equal continuous stream; there are times with it, when the slow course of ages gathers itself up, as it were, into the compass of moments, and the meaning of a thousand years is precipitated into the rush of a few days. Then it is that the far past and the far future, the "ends of the ages" as St. Paul calls them, seem to meet and come together in the instantaneous present. Of such character, most emphatically, is the period here under consideration, the brief space of time that has

passed since I last stood before you as now in the summer of 1853. Since then, the index-hand on the dial-plate of the world's history has swept an arc, which may be said fairly to confound all human calculation. The sense of ages has come into view through our late American war, and is now pouring itself forward with cataract force in its mighty issues and consequences—political, moral, social, economic, scientific, and religious—as never in any like period of the world's life before.

Regarded simply as an act in the drama of our own national existence, the political struggle through which we have passed must be acknowledged to be the grandest that has ever had place among men. The world has never before known such a war; the life and death struggle of such a nation as this, caught suddenly in the anaconda folds of so vast a rebellion born from its own bosom; a war of such huge proportions, carried forward on so broad a field, and hurried through to such overwhelming results in so short a period of time. For the nation itself, of course, the importance of it, in its relations to the past and in its bearings on the future, is beyond all description, and indeed as yet beyond all knowledge or imagination. All that may have been new or great, or full of interest, in the previous history of the country: its discovery more than three centuries ago, its colonies and colonial times, its war of independence, the foundation and adoption of its constitution, and whatever has been of account in the enlargement of its resources or in the development of its powers since; all is found at last, I say, gathering itself up into the grandeur of this last crisis, and showing itself to have been significant only as it has served to prepare the way for its advent. Here, in a most profound sense, it may be said that a nation has been born in a day. For all that had place before in the life of these United States deserves to be considered, and spoken of, as little better than an embryonic existence, over against the new order of being we have been ushered into through the mighty parturition pains and throes of the late war. Whatever we may have thought of the war itself during its progress, now that it is over, if we have any faith in the future of the nation at all, we can-

not possibly fail to see in it the presence of a power, which must determine our character and destiny as a people, in the most universal and radical way, for all time to come. It is in vain to disguise it; we have passed through a revolution; or shall I not say rather, we are still in the midst of a revolution, greater than any yet known to the nations of Europe; greater altogether than that from which our political freedom dates in 1776; a revolution wrought out organically from the inmost forces of the national life, which in such view amounts to a regeneration, profound and deep as the foundations of this life itself. Well may we bow before it with wondering, awe-struck admiration; for it is the wonder of all wonders in these last times. It has been to the nation like the baptism of the Red Sea. Old things have been made to pass away by it; and now, lo, all things are becoming new.

How much this revolution means becomes still more evident, when we take into view, in connection with it, the way in which the conditions and terms of our national life, externally considered, are found to correspond with it; so demanding and requiring it, as it now seems, that it is hard to see how they could have been met and satisfied in any other way. It is in the light of such correspondences especially, springing from the depths, and coming, as it were, from the farthest ends of the earth, that the hand of God reveals itself in history. Without dwelling upon the subject at large, let it suffice now to say, that this nation, as we believe, was planted and kept apart in the Western world for high purposes peculiar to itself; that it has been possible for it, in the conditions in which it has heretofore stood, to obey its vocation or mission successfully thus far under its first relatively defective organization; that with its own growth, however, and the progress of things generally, this was becoming more and more impracticable; when all at once, and as it were to meet the emergency, the political crisis before us burst forth in fire and blood, making room for a new ordering of the State, which, it is to be hoped, will be found answerable to its enlarged necessities and responsibilities in all time to come. Our late war has been for us, in this view, immeasurably more

than the simple putting down of the rebellion from which it sprang. It has borne us through the pillars of Hercules, out into the broad ocean of a life, of which we had no conception before. It has roused us, as a people, to self-consciousness; lifted us into manhood; brought home to us the sense of our own resources; and given us a history, it has been well said, "which even the war powers of the old world must respect and acknowledge as a title to the fellowship of great nations." It has brought us suddenly abreast with the great moving forces of the age, and compelled us to hold ourselves in line with them from this time onward, as the necessary condition of our whole future existence. It has settled the question of our national unity, before always more or less problematical and uncertain. It has tested the strength and stability of our republican constitution, and demonstrated the possibility of popular self-government on a scale, and to an extent, beyond all that it had entered into the heart of man hitherto to imagine or conceive. We are fairly bewildered and lost, in trying to take in the measure of our present greatness, the momentum of our present onward course, as compared with all we have been before. The colossal proportions of our late war, have made the nation all at once gigantic. The popular mind has grown familiar with gigantic thoughts, gigantic purposes, and gigantic deeds. We are ready to bridge the Hellespont, or tunnel Mount Athos, at a moment's warning. Never before has the world seen or heard of such wonders of energy and strength, as have attended, and are now still following, the four years' struggle through which we have passed. They have distanced all comparison, confounded all calculation, turned all precedent to confusion and shame. No wonder that the hoary state craft of Europe is made to stand aghast, at what might seem to be so universal a breaking away from old time formulas and rules; for here, emphatically, all the traditions of the past are found to be at fault. Our public debt, in this view, is sublime; and still more so, of course, our public credit maintained thus far through it all, and the stupendous fiscal administration which is moving steadily onward, in conjunction with the free pleasure of the people, to its full, speedy liquidation.

And more sublime, in some respects, even than the war itself, is the work of political reorganization now in progress, by which the nation is to be formed and fitted for the career of glory that now stretches before it, with seemingly interminable prospect, through the far distant future. Of this coming greatness, what tongue can adequately speak? How can we reflect on the truly continental character which has come even now to invest all the elements of our growth; the rebounding vitality, the feeling of endless strength, the sense of inward enlargement, with which we have come out from our Briarean struggle; our mighty territory, reaching from sea to sea; the rate at which our population is increasing every year by the natural law of birth; the incalculable tide of immigration (a more important *Völkerwanderung* than any the world has ever witnessed before), by which the life of all European nationalities is now to be poured into our bosom in a way as yet hardly dreamed of by any; the new fields of untold, unimaginable wealth, on the earth and under the earth, which are soon to make our national debt seem lighter than a feather; the victories of art over nature on all sides among us, by which mountains are levelled and valleys raised before the march of modern improvement, by which time and distance are more and more surmounted, and the compact unity of the country is made to keep pace fully, and even more than fully, with its greatest geographical expansion: how, I say, can we reflect on all this (crossing the continent, for example, with the eloquently thoughtful eye of a Colfax), and not feel ourselves absolutely overwhelmed by the solemn sense of what is around us, the thrilling apprehension of what is before us, in the present condition of our country!

But to estimate properly what this condition involves, we must take into consideration more than these relatively outward elements and forces, as concerned in the working out of the problem it brings to our view. There are concerned in what is thus going forward, at the same time, the historical forces of the world's modern mind and thought, the issues of its past science, the results of its past morality and religion, the deepest instincts of its present spiritual life, its profoundest political

ideas,—in a word, we may say, the inmost philosophy of the age. These spiritual and moral forces, now deeply at work everywhere in our modern civilization, no less, I say, than the more outward powers before spoken of, are tending with accumulating strength toward the introduction of a new order of life for the world at large, a new era altogether in the world's social and political history; and in doing so, it is plain that they are throwing themselves more and more, with united volume, into the onward moving destiny of our vast American Republic. Here they are to have their central field of action. Here only they are to find full outlet for their impetuous tide, and free commensurate scope for its overflowing course in time to come. We feel all this sensibly now, as never before, in the grand political epoch which has come upon us within the last few years; and this especially it is, that makes the epoch beyond expression solemn, as gathering up in itself the sense of centuries past, and carrying in its womb at the same time the sense of centuries yet unborn. Here now, it would seriously seem, are to be settled and solved the great life questions, that are becoming more and more the burden of humanity, the mystery of the last days, the ominous approximation of the present order of the world to its full winding up in the second coming of Christ.

In all that has now been said, we are made to feel the prospective greatness of this country in a way it might have seemed extravagant to dream of only a few years ago; and can thus apprehend, in the light of it, the unutterable, illimitable significance of what has lately come to pass in our history. The curtain is suddenly lifted before our eyes, revealing to us an entirely new scheme in the drama of our national existence, and opening to our astonished gaze a vista of coming wonders more marvellous than the wildest creations of Arabian tale or Persian romance. The nation is shut up, we now see plainly, by the very conditions of its existence, to a career and destination without any sort of parallel in the history of the Old World. The massive kingdoms of Asia, and the more thoroughly organized governments of Europe, are to be repeated here in a form that shall be found

to unite in itself the highest ideal of both—political mass, in the widest and largest view, actuated throughout by the unity of free, intelligent soul. For the country, it would now seem to be providentially ordained, must remain one, in spite of all territorial extension. This at once sunders it from all transatlantic examples. It can be no second England, or Germany, or France; just as little as it can reiterate the ancient life of Greece or Rome. Then, with boundless territory, must come, also, boundless population; a tide of life that shall outswell now all past rates of growth; rising and spreading with magic rapidity; sweeping, rolling, rushing over the broad, reclaimed wastes of the sunny South, and over the prairies, forests, and sierras of the mighty West; millions upon millions, a multitude which no man can number. And along with this again, in simultaneous progression, a corresponding development of material resources and power; wealth springing out of the earth, and flowing through the rivers, and bursting from the mountains on every side; cities in magnificent profusion; the vast arteries of commerce and trade, together with the nerves of electric intelligence, reaching over the continent in all directions, and binding it together with the sense of common interest, and the consciousness of common life. Westward, of a truth, the star of empire, the march of civilization, takes its way; and having now passed round the globe, the movement would appear to have come really to its conclusion here in touching the shores of the Pacific, while the historical course of the centuries, at the same time, is precipitating itself, with strange synchronistic coincidence, upon the same continental theatre; to work out, as it were, what St. Peter calls the "end of all things," on a scale answerable to the dimensions of so vast a problem. For no one can imagine, surely, that our American life, or the life of the world rather, in this, its last form, can ever advance upon itself, by entering upon a new circuit of civilization and culture in Asia. *Thus far, and no farther!* is the law prescribed for it by the Pacific Ocean. Here the end has come round again to the beginning; the historical ages have run their predestined course; the extremities look each other in the face; the dumb prophecy of

China, holding in stagnation, since the days of Confucius, well-nigh half the population of the globe, is confronted at last with its own far-off fulfilment (though without understanding it), in what are soon to be the multitudinous millions of these United States—a population equal to its own, not Mongolian, but Caucasian, in the latest style of this dominant race, with all its energies developed in full force, and brought into universal action. All things conspire plainly to show here the presence of the last times, and to proclaim the coming in, on a grand scale, of what must be considered the closing scene of the world's history, in its present order and form.

The interests of the whole world thus are bound up in what has been going forward of late in our country; and we are made to feel solemnly that the national crisis through which we are now passing is, in very truth, a world-crisis, greater and more decisive than any the world has ever previously known. It is no longer the dream of American vanity, simply to speak of the significance of America in this way. It is fast becoming sober earnest for the nations of Europe themselves. Our late war was echoed in the universal heart of the Old World, and met responsive vibrations everywhere in its conflicting opinions, sympathies, and wishes; as the issue of it, also, has entered deeply into the soul of all countries, and is already working out consequences which no foresight of man can measure or reveal. In a profound sense, the struggle was representative for the race at large. The tread of its armies, the thunder of its battles, shook the entire earth, and wrought deliverance for humanity such as has never been wrought by the agency of war before. In the language of Professor Goldwin Smith's late brilliant address in England: "Not the fields on which Greek intellect and art were saved from the Persian; not the fields on which Roman law and polity were saved from the Carthaginian and the Gaul; not the plains of Tours, on which Charles Martel rolled back Islam from the heart of Christendom; not the waters over which the shattered Armada fled; not Leipsic and Lutzen, Marston and Naseby, where, at the hands of Gustavus and Cromwell, the great reaction of the seventeenth century found

its doom, will be so consecrated by the gratitude of after ages as Vicksburg and Gettysburg, Atlanta, and those lines before Richmond which saw the final blow."

All with us now, as a nation, has been, and still continues to be, world-historical in the fullest sense of the term. We know it, and feel it, more and more continually, on all sides. Our thinking and working have come to be of boundless signification for the human race. The greatest questions of life, the last problems of history, are fast crowding upon us for their solution. Here is to be settled, on a grand scale, how far men are capable of self-government in a truly free way; how far the interests of public authority and personal independence can be made to meet harmoniously in the same political system. Here is to be issued and adjudicated practically the old arch-controversy, between the rights of man, as they are called, and the duties of man. Here are to be met, and answered in some way, the tremendous politico-economical and social problems, which are even now stirring the lowest depths of our modern civilization, and threatening like a subterranean mine to blow it into ten thousand fragments. Here is to be resolved the great ethnological question, which is to determine finally the relation of the inferior races to the Caucasian in the consummation of the world's history. Here is to be seen, how far material prosperity and mere humanitarian culture (the life of man in the order of nature) can be made to follow their own law, in harmony with the higher interests of virtue, morality, and religion. Here are to be shown, in the end, we must believe, the mightiest achievements of science, the greatest wonders of art, the most stupendous victories in the service of commerce and trade. Above all in interest for us, here must be settled the great ecclesiastical issues, with which the whole Christian world is wrestling at the present time, and which are felt by thousands everywhere to involve nothing less than the question of life or death for the universal cause of Christianity itself.

Yes, my beloved hearers, there is no room now, I think to doubt it. Here on this Western Continent is to be the arena where the Church Question, which all truly earnest men feel

and know to be the greatest question of the age, is to be fought out, if I may use the expression to its last consequences and results. We cannot take our answer to it quietly from the Romanism, or Anglicanism, or Continental Protestantism of transatlantic Europe; nor yet from the Græco-Russian and other forms of Christianity, that challenge our attention in the far East. On the contrary, these older church interests, if they are to maintain their standing in the world, must throw themselves into the new conditions of our American life, and prove themselves able to master them, and to bend them to their own service in a free way. Christianity here, of course, if it is to remain true to itself, can never cease to be historical; can never abjure its connection with the past; as it is required to do by the radical sects that are continually springing up like mushrooms on its path. But neither on the other hand, can it be a mere mechanical outward tradition. It must enter into active struggle with the seething elements around it, and assert its necessary form, whatever that may be, as the "law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus." Here then the controversy between Christ and Antichrist, the mystical battle of Armageddon, must be waged to its ultimate decision. That is to be, of course, a struggle between faith and unbelief. But the unbelief, we have reason to be sure, will not be so much open infidelity, as the false show of faith itself—the metamorphosis of Satan into an angel of light, opposition to the Gospel claiming to be the truth and power of the Gospel in its fullest sense. And so the ultimate matter in debate will not just be: Is the Bible true and worthy of confidence as God's word? but this rather: Is Christ real, as the perpetual presence of a new creation in the world through which only life and immortality are brought to light? The war will fall back practically to the basis of all positive Christianity, as we have it set forth comprehensively in the Apostles' Creed. The questions will be at bottom: Is the Creed true? Has Christ come in the flesh, as is there affirmed? Is what we are told of the grand movement of the work of redemption in His Person, fact or figment? Did He indeed go down into death and hades, that He might re-

turn again leading captivity captive, and ascend up on high so as to fill all things, and to become head over all things to the Church? Is there in virtue of all this an order of grace in the world—the mystery the Creed proclaims in its article of the Church—a divine constitution of life and power transcending the whole order of nature; which as such is a necessary object of Christian faith; which the gates of hell can never prevail against; and in which alone are comprehended the redemption and salvation of the world through all time? These are questions that go to the very foundation of Christianity; and the issue involved in them is nothing less than the general right of Christianity to be regarded as a strictly supernatural system of religion, over against all forms of natural or simply humanitarian religion, usurping its name and pretending to stand in its place. It will be, in one word, the old battle between rationalism and faith, the powers of this present world and the powers of the world to come, advanced now to its deepest, most inward and most universal form; on which will be found to be staked the truth of all revelation from the beginning; and which in its last grand crisis shall serve to usher in, we may trust, the bright appearing of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Himself, when He shall come to be glorified in His saints and admired in all them that believe.

All signs thus, herald the approach of a new era in the history of the world, more important than any which has gone before; and all conditions join to show, that this era is to have its central development here, on this Western Continent, and in the bosom of our American Republic. But now, what view are we to take of the elements, agencies, and forces—political, moral, educational, and scientific—which are marshalling themselves on such vast scale, on all sides, for the accomplishment of the mighty change that is thus before us; and what judgment are we to form of their relation ultimately to that "end of all things," in which the cause of Christianity, if it be of God, is to come to its final and complete triumph, as we have just seen, over all opposing powers? No inquiry can well be more interesting or practically solemn than this, however diffi-

cult, for all who look thoughtfully at the present condition of the world, and desire in view of it to order their own lives to the wisest and best purpose. I can only glance at the subject now in the most general and cursory way.

In the view of many, the revolutionary forces which are now everywhere at work in our modern civilization, causing old things to pass away and all things to become new, are themselves, not simply precursive, but in the fullest sense preformative, of what is to be at last the deliverance of the world from its present state of bondage and sin. The redemption of humanity is to be reached, they suppose, through these powers working themselves out to their own natural results. They see in the political, social, scientific, and educational movements of the age, the very factors of the world's final regeneration; and fondly dream and talk of a "good time coming," a millennium near at hand, in which the last sense of Christianity shall be reached, and the tabernacle of God made to be with men; through the triumphs of mind over matter; by means of steamships, Atlantic telegraphs and Pacific railroads; by universal civil freedom, universal knowledge, universal brotherhood of races and nations, universal politico-economical wisdom—making altogether a reign of mundane righteousness, that will show itself a reign at the same time, of boundless outward prosperity, comfort, and wealth. It is easy especially to be carried away with this sort of thinking, in looking at the momentous changes, which are going forward in our own country, world-significant as they can be seen plainly to be at the present time, and profoundly linked as they are no less plainly with the central power of the world's life in the form of morality and religion. All must feel that the power of Christianity is deeply at work in these wonders. All must feel, that if Christianity be the end of the ways of God among men, these wonders cannot possibly be without reference to the coming of His kingdom—that they are in fact progressive victories and gains on the side of this kingdom, which are serving to make room more and more for its full ultimate advent. And then what more natural than to see in them at once the actual presence of Christianity it-

self, working in them and through them immediately to its own ends, as something identical with their first and nearest signification; and thus to take them as being, in and of themselves, true manifestations of faith and righteousness in the highest Christian sense of these terms. Thus loyalty and patriotism are made to be synonymous with devotion to the service of God; battle-fields become the gate of entrance into paradise; heroes are canonized into saints; martyrs of liberty are exalted into martyrs of Christ; statesmen and politicians put themselves forward as the chosen prophets of God's will; and the march of events (though it may be but John Brown's soul marching on—God only knows whither), is trumpeted to the four winds of heaven as the stately goings of Jehovah Jesus Himself, riding forth prosperously to subdue the nations under His feet. Thus in every way the successful appliances of science, art, business, or politics, to the well-being of men in the present world, are counted to be directly the power of the everlasting Gospel fulfilling with free course its own heavenly mission; and so it comes to pass that the power of the Gospel, the cause of true evangelical religion, is supposed at last to reside mainly in the world under its secular character, on the outside of the Church and her sacraments altogether. Creeds and confessions serve but to retard the chariot of salvation. The enemies of Christianity claim to be its heroes and apostles, its truest representatives and its best expounders; and the nominally Christian world, alas, is found only too willing on all sides to admit the claim.

This, I say, is the great temptation of the age—the temptation of resolving the whole idea of God's kingdom in the world into the powers and forces of the world itself, stirred and set in motion by the presence of the higher life that has been brought down into it, without being lifted still into its true sphere. So it was in the beginning of Christianity in a more outward way, when all the elements of Grecian and Oriental thought were roused by it to the task of constructing new philosophies, Gnostic and Platonic, that might take its place, and do for it better than itself, its Heaven-commissioned work. It was hard then

to stand firm and fast in the faith of Christ. But now it is harder still; for the relation between the two orders of grace and nature, the contact of one with the other, has come to be far more inward and close now than it was then, and the conflict involved in it is for this reason, in the same proportion, more spiritual and profound; so that the very elect are in continual danger of being deceived by it to the loss of their own steadfastness. Let me then, in the way of warning, reiterate solemnly on the present occasion what I have tried to make the burden of my teaching on this subject in former years. Nature is not Grace. That which is born of the flesh is at last, in its highest sublimation, flesh only, and not Spirit. It can never, in its own order, save the world. Ye, surely, have not so learned Christ. However the earth may help the Church, you know that it is not in the power of the earth to create the Church, or to take into its own hands the office and work of the Church. The mastery of mind over matter, whether in the way of knowledge or of art, is not in and of itself the raising of man to glory and honor. The race can never be brought right, and made to be what it ought to be, by machinery, or mere outward social economy of any sort; and just as little can it be redeemed by politics, education, or science. Its true regeneration, if there be truth in the Gospel, must come ultimately from above, and not from beneath. Humanitarianism is not Christianity; and the Gospel of such men as Emerson, Theodore Parker, Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and others whose names come easily to mind now in the same connection, is not the Gospel of Jesus Christ as it lies before us in the New Testament. The millennium it promises is not the reign of the saints foretold by prophets and apostles; and it is only too plain, alas! that the agencies and tendencies which are held to be working toward it, carry in them no sure guaranty whatever of millennial triumph in any form. All the signs of the time, as we have seen, betoken universal and fundamental change. But we have no assurance in these signs, that the change will move on victoriously in the line of universal righteousness and truth. On the contrary, it is all too plain that the elements and forces which are bringing

on the new era, are themselves fraught with a power of evil, which may prove altogether too strong in the end for all they appear to have in them as a power of good. Along with titanic strength, we see at work on all sides titanic corruption and sin. The very effort that is made to scale the heavens, in the way of material aggrandizement and politico-social self-exaltation, seems to invite upon itself the thunderbolts of Divine wrath, and to foreshadow a confusion worse than that of old on the plains of Shinar. We cannot trust the ground on which the age is standing. We know that it is volcanic. We cannot look forth with full security on the boundless ocean before us. It may be—our hearts tell us—an ocean of storms and wrecks, more terrible than any the world has ever yet known.

This is one lesson we are required to take home to ourselves, in the present state of our country and of the world. But it is not the only lesson. We are required, on the other hand, to see and feel that the great things which are now coming to pass around us, and looming into sight before us, are indeed part of God's plan for the final bringing in of His kingdom; and that we, therefore, can be true and faithful to this cause, in our generation, only as we throw ourselves with free consciousness into the movement, and endeavor to work in and through it for Christian purposes and ends. We have no right to ignore the rushing tide of history, or to stand aside from the torrent with which it is bearing all things in its own direction. Indeed, we cannot do so, if we would. For history here is beyond all question world-history; and we must move and work wakingly in the bosom of it, if we are to have any real life whatever in the life of the world. This does not mean, of course, that we are to surrender our minds blindly to the general spirit of the age, as being in and of itself the Spirit of God (*vox populi, vox Dei*); or that we are to trust the movement of the age, as being at once in its reigning factoral forces the wisdom and power of God, working positively toward the ideal of a perfect humanity. We may fear, or we may be sure, that the relation of all to the coming end will be found at last to be that of negative, more than direct positive, preparation for its advent; even as the old Oriental

and Grecian worlds prepared the way, in their vain endeavors "by wisdom to know God," for the coming of Christ in the flesh. But even in this view, the historical significance of the movement cannot be questioned, and we are bound to take interest in it accordingly. We must be children of our country, and also children of our age. So much is demanded of us, both by our philosophy and by our religion. Only let us try to be so, by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, in such sort that we shall be likewise all children of the light, and true sons of God in being at the same time true sons of the Church.

Among other interests requiring to be held thus in union and correspondence with the vast advancing movement which is upon us, the cause of education especially deserves to be spoken of at this time—being as it is, the bond of our Academic brotherhood, and the common interest which brings us together on the present occasion.

Like all other interests in the country, it is thrown into agitation, and forced toward revolutionary change, by the power of the general revolution through which the country is now passing. It is moving historically with the movement of our national history at large. Evidently we have come to a sort of crisis here as elsewhere, and a new era of education is breaking upon us, no less than a new era of politics and religion.

The thoughts of men with regard to the subject are expanded; and along with expanded thoughts, are coming to be revealed new zeal, new liberty, new activity, in its service. Indeed, one of the most striking features of the time is the disposition which has begun to be shown, in every direction, to patronize and encourage learning and education in all forms. Donations on the part of rich men, in favor of literary institutions, are growing to be munificent, in some cases even princely. The scale of college endowments, and college organizations, is everywhere enlarged. Even in our own State, proverbially slow and niggardly heretofore in the cause of letters, a new spirit is showing itself at work. Normal schools and collegiate academies are with us now the order of the day. All our old colleges are seeking to double their strength; while the munificence of one man has planted on the banks of the Lehigh lately a new insti-

tution, which threatens at a single bound to surpass the foundations of the whole of them together.

But it is not only the outward economy of education that is undergoing enlargement and change in this way. Still more worthy of note, is the corresponding change that is going forward in its inward economy. This is still more directly the result of the general revolution in which the age is involved, and shows more significantly at the same time its ruling character and drift. All the conditions of the age, all the conditions especially of our American life, carrying in its bosom at this time, as we have seen, the inmost and deepest historical forces of the age, form in themselves for the minds of men what may be called a powerful determination now toward outward and material interests, the conquering of nature, the arts and methods of political well-being,—in one word, the reduction of the present world in every way to the service of the human race. Hence the demand, on all sides, for forms of education, that shall be found ministering everywhere directly to this general object; and in conformity with it, as we see, all manner of attempts to bring our schools and colleges into line with what is thus felt to be the inevitable law of the age. Hence new courses of study all over the land, in which the practical and utilitarian figure as the main thing in science, and learning is made to resolve itself, in great measure, into the knowledge of matter, simply, and nature.

A striking illustration of the power this way of thinking has among us may be found in the *Smithsonian Institution*, standing as it does in some sense at the head of our educational interests. According to the terms of its magnificent endowment, it was founded for the *Increase and Diffusion of Knowledge among Men.* In the organization of it, we are told, "no restriction is made in favor of any kind of knowledge, and hence each branch is entitled to, and should receive a share of attention." That is the theory. But see now, how it has been carried into effect. From the commencement of its operations in 1847, down to the present time, it seems to have been quietly assumed that the increase of knowledge among men must be

taken to mean only the promotion of science under its predominantly physical aspects; and the "Smithsonian Contributions," accordingly, are found to be devoted to this object throughout, with no recognition whatever, apparently, of the necessity of science under any other form. Physical Geography, Coast Surveys, Aboriginal Monuments, Palæontology, Geology, Zoology, Botany, Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, Chemistry, Mineralogy, Agriculture, and the Application of Science to Arts; these, and kindred subjects, engross the activity and the income of the Institution; while all that is comprehended in the culture of Mind for its own sake, Morality, Humane Literature, Metaphysics, and Philosophy in all its branches and forms, is silently ignored and forgotten, as having nothing to do with the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men in any way. The fact is curious, certainly, and significant; and may be taken as a proclamation to the world, on a large scale, of what Science, Education, and Progress, are coming more and more to mean for the spirit of the Nineteenth Century, as it is now sweeping all things before it in the newborn life of these United States.

It is no business of ours to denounce or oppose the changes by which other colleges are seeking to adapt themselves to the educational demands of this spirit at the present time. Let us hope that all such experiments may work toward good ultimately in some way. It is enough for us to know that we, as the friends of Franklin and Marshall College, are not called upon to fall in with the movement. Our circumstances do not allow us to cope, if we would, with the stronger bids that are made for popular favor in this form; and there is no need or occasion for us to be putting forth our strength for what can be more effectually accomplished from other quarters. Our vocation, too, it is plain, is altogether different. If we are to be of any account in the cause of learning and education, it must be by our holding on steadfastly to what has been the reigning purpose and character of this institution from the beginning; and instead of finding in the present bearing of things a reason for changing our course, we should see in it rather only new

reason for our continuing unswervingly true to it to the last. For if the general bearing of the age be, in the way we have seen, more and more toward merely material interests and outward ends, it is but all the more necessary that our testimony, if it have been worth anything heretofore, in favor of education for its own sake and for purely spiritual or inward ends, should not now be relaxed, but be made, if possible, more firm than ever. This, especially, is needed at the present time; and in no other way possibly can we, with our resources and opportunities, do better service to our country and our generation.

Let it be our ambition, then, and our care, to maintain in vigorous force here, an institution that shall be devoted supremely to liberal education, in the old and proper sense of the term; *liberal*, as being free from all bondage to merely outside references and ends, and as having to do, first of all, with the enlargement of the mind in its own sphere. This, after all, must remain the true conception of education forever. We need not quarrel with other forms of knowledge and skill, that are held with many now to carry with them the whole force of the name. Let them pass for what they are actually worth, in their utilitarian, practical, and professional sphere. But no such forms of knowledge can ever be sufficient, of themselves, to complete the organization of a true human culture. Underneath all such practical superstructure, if it is to stand, must be at least a basis of solid spiritual thought; and if many, in their studies, make all in all of the outward, it will only be the more necessary always that some (though few) make all in all of the inward. In such a time as ours especially, and in view of the grand historical crisis, through which, as a nation, we are now passing, it is all-important that the working spirit of the country should be leavened, to some wholesome extent, by a corresponding thinking spirit. Never was there a time, when there was more room or more need for education, regarded simply as a discipline of the soul for its own sake. Agriculture, mining, and civil engineering, are of vast account; but not of so much account, by any means, as the development of a strong and free spirit in men themselves. It still remains true, as in all ages,

that ideas are the deepest power in the world; and the most salutary forces of the world's life will ever be found to be, in the end, not those which men are enabled to draw from the storehouses of nature, and in this way, as it were, from beyond themselves, but those that are comprehended in the right ordering and proper constitution of their own minds. There lies the end emphatically of all true education.

Let it not be imagined, however, that in thus opposing the spiritual to the physical, I mean to discourage the study of nature, or to detract from its importance in a course of academical training. For us in this world, the spiritual depends everywhere on the physical, has its root in the physical, starts forth from the physical, and is qualified and conditioned by the physical throughout. There can be, therefore, no effectual study of mind, that is not grounded, first of all, in the study of nature; and so, of course, no thorough or complete education, without the natural sciences. In this view, the zeal which is now shown in favor of these sciences, and the wonderful success with which they are pursued, are a matter for congratulation; and form unquestionably one of those pregnant signs of the time, which we are bound wisely to respect and turn to account, in seeking to give historical direction to any part we may take in the cause of education at the present time. All we need to protest against in the case, is the insanity of making nature, in its own sphere, the end of all knowledge; the madness of imagining, that moral interests can ever be subordinated safely to material interests; the wild hallucination of dreaming, that the great battle and work of life for man is to be accomplished by physics and mechanics, by insight simply into the laws of nature and mastery of its powers, by chemistry, geology, mineralogy, metallurgy, and other such studies, by polytechnic ingenuity and skill applied in all manner of ways to business and trade. There is a higher view than all this, in which the study of nature becomes itself the study of mind, and the material meets us everywhere as the sacrament of the spiritual and divine. It is the view presented to us in the first chapter of Genesis, where all lower forms of creation are described as rising organ-

ically, stage after stage, to the completion of their full sense ultimately in man; from the light of whose presence then, thrown back upon time, they come to be irradiated with a portion of the same glory that belongs to man himself as the image of God. It is easy to see how, in such view, room is made in our scheme of a liberal education for the largest use of natural science; how it is, that there can be no right philosophy of spirit, which is not, at the same time, a philosophy of nature in its profoundest sense; how physics and metaphysics go hand in hand together, each helping the other to its proper perfection, and both joining to bear the soul up finally to those empyrean heights, where knowledge ends in religion, and the vision of the world is made complete in the vision of Him who is before all worlds—the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

ART. II.—ENGLISH LITERATURE AND THE REFORMATION.

BY E. E. HIGBEE, D. D., PROFESSOR IN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, MERCERSBURG, PA.

We propose, in the following article, to make some general remarks upon the literature of England, keeping especially in view the influence exerted upon it by that epoch of the modern world,—the Reformation of the sixteenth century. This epoch, so significant in history, marks the concentration of tendencies and forces active long before it, as well as the beginning of a new era, in which, as thus concentrated, these tendencies and forces form the germs of a long-after development and growth. Both processes, therefore, that going before and that which comes after, must be taken into view, and in their natural order, before the English national life or literature can be properly understood.

The barbaric tribes of Europe came under the influence of classic civilization, when they were yet without any proper national organization. They roamed the forests in rude multitudes, and on wild adventure, when Greece and Rome had already reached their

summit of development. At the introduction of Christianity, the history of these latter, in the form of heathen culture, may be said to have been accomplished. Their language and literature, their philosophy and art, their science and polity and religion, had already become the reigning factors of the world's progress. Not so, however, with the Teutonic and Slavic north. Their language, like their manners, was wild and rude; and as yet no literature, or art, or settled polity, had given determinateness to the vast, undeveloped energy of their spirit. Yet they had within themselves the substance of a grand future. The Teutonic world especially, in its rude simplicity, its robust independence, its heartfelt sense of freedom, not yet come to a clear consciousness of itself in the barbaric mind; and therefore, while lacking the restraints of law and forms of reason, and, above all, the perfecting and controlling presence of Christianity, running into bold licentiousness, possessed withal the germs which could develop into the magnificent growth of modern history. It is true, these germs were hidden,—save, perhaps, to the penetrating glance of a Tacitus; yet even in the tumultuary social life of this barbaric world, there can be discovered, wakening into activity, and finding utterance in rude poems and bold mythologies, a spirit and genius which are prophetic of the noble career before it. Such prophecy, however, could reach out to no proper fulfilment without centuries of development. Ages of severe discipline seem to have been necessary, before the barbaric spirit, under the influence of Christianity, could properly realize its own contents, or enter with full consciousness upon the great mission assigned to it by God. This development and discipline, from the force of surrounding history, began and continued under the guiding control of a language and literature and civilization foreign to the peculiar spirit of the people itself.

The Christian Church had gathered up within her own bosom the historical force of Greek and Roman culture; and when the frontiers of the Roman empire were broken in upon, and its political structure shattered to pieces, the barbarians had still to meet the whole reality of its civilization, preserved and now

made invincible by the presence and permeation of Christian life. Before this new power of civilization Christianized, which confronted them in the Church, they bowed. At this time the Church had a developed theology, and a uniform consolidated organization in her hierarchy. Under the control of all this the barbaric world came, yet not in such sense as to part with its own proper and distinctive spirit. It was this spirit, illumined and made conscious of itself, and moved with even greater impulse, by Christianity, which was, under Providence, to carry the world's process onward still nearer to its consummation. It was this spirit which had within itself a new and higher problem of life to solve, and which, disciplined and developed by the Church, was to take up the main current of history, and become the ruling element of the world,—the profound and characterizing energy of modern civilization. The middle ages mark the disciplining process of the barbaric world,—a period in which were swelling beneath the surface the germs of a literature and legislation and order of life quite distinct from that of classic Greece or Rome.

During this period, the Teutonic world, in none of its phases, was in condition to develop a national literature. As yet it had come to no full consciousness of itself. It had not passed its childhood. It had not reached that point of self-energy, when it could pour into the current of history the self-determined and self-directed vigor of its own developed life. Its immense capacity and giant force, which had partially revealed themselves in the colossal empire of Karl the Great, and the magnificent enthusiasm of the Crusades, and the romantic splendor of chivalry, had not yet become organized under such a clear self-apprehension as to be directed with concentrated aim to the great mission to which Providence was calling it. Especially is this seen in the sphere of literature. The whole culture of mind was conducted in a language foreign to the spirit of the people. Being under the direct supervision of the Church, the whole interest of intellectual development was confined to the monasteries. Monks were the only scholars of the world, and monastic schools formed the germs out of which grew all

the great mediæval universities. The martial, independent, wildly free spirit of the Teuton could not at once be tamed down to study and mental discipline in such form. He made history with his lance, and enjoyed his leisure from battle in banquet and tourney; while some ecclesiastic, here and there, was painting the letters of an arid chronicle, or embellishing the legend of a saint. We would not deny the great importance of this monastic labor in that tumultuous age. Schools like that of York, from which such scholars as Alcuin proceeded to lay the foundations of literary culture in the great Frankish empire, were indeed the salvation, we may say, of what was left to mankind of the world's intellectual treasures. Their discipline, however, under the circumstances of history, was entirely insufficient to stimulate the surrounding barbaric mind to any original literary activity. The impetuous knight, in whom the original Teutonic spirit was most especially predominant, did not come to any extent under its power. Only when harassed by a life of unbridled passions, and wearied out with ceaseless conflicts, would he seek the solace of cloistered retirement and reflection. And again, in the Latin language, he could not pour out the warm breath of his own heart. He could find in it no proper embodiment of his own genuine spirit. It was, after all, but a dry shell, lacking the kernel and juice of his own life. It might answer certain ends, as we find it did, in the great works of the scholastic doctors; but it could never become truly one with the new and fresh spirit of the people at large. It was not their vernacular; and with it, therefore, as a medium or instrument only, a genuine national literature was quite impossible. Only in a language which is of the very flesh and blood of the people, which moves pulsing with the current of their own life, which, growing with their growth, and strengthening with their strength, incorporates with itself the very spirit which underlies and characterizes their whole development, can a national literature, properly so called, manifest itself. However intimately related historically two nations may be with the life and language of each other, and however much influence such familiarity may exercise, yet, as settled down to a determi-

nate national life, their genius and spirit are so essentially distinct, and so vitally infused into their separate vernaculars, that it is a sheer impossibility for either one to give birth to anything permanently characteristic as belonging to its own literature in the tongue of the other. Indeed, no such attempt will ever be made by a genius; for what characterizes the inspiration of such an one is the living communion in which he stands with the inward, *universal* life of humanity, it is true, yet only as this reveals itself to his imagination in the bosom of that national life, of which he appears in his own sphere as the conscious representative and interpreter.

The truth of this general thought is clearly seen in the literature of Rome as related to that of Greece. No two nations, perhaps, were ever more intimately associated historically. The whole range of Grecian language and literature, as a present, living reality also, was familiar to the Roman, and no doubt largely influenced his creative energies and thought, as it did his style: yet Roman genius could only utter itself in the Roman tongue. This was, after all, the essential flesh and blood of its own spirit,—the only matrix where its conceptions could take their proper body, and come to any natural birth.

But to return.—We have said, that the new Teutonic spirit could develop no national literature in a language so foreign as the Latin, and that this language ruled the schools throughout the middle ages, and in way of form guided the whole activity of thought. Yet even in the use of the Latin, the fact is clearly manifest that the peculiar national life which had enshrined itself there in the classic age, was in no sense congenial with that life which was now becoming active in the movements of history. The mediæval Latin literature which was in any sense the product of the age, and not mere imitation of some Roman model, gives plain indications of the presence and influence of a power modifying the language and bringing it into broad contrast with its classic forms, and thus partially giving utterance to the new order of life which was at work. The Latin hymns of mediæval Christendom move with the advance of the nations, gradually farther and farther from the form of

classic poetry. The Iambic dimetres of the old Ambrosian hymns were still, though in the feeblest way, linked to the classic metrical system, resting upon quantity rather than upon accent; but soon these links were entirely broken, and rhythm based upon accentuation, which characterizes modern verse, was fully developed, and together with this also a new melodic richness in way of rhyme. A moment's contrast between the Odes of Horace, with their faultless rhythm, and any mediæval hymn clustering with its rhymes, will show this. How different, for example, not only in substance, but in its whole movement and form, is the poem of Bunard of Cluni, "*de contemptu mundi*," from any thing which meets us in the classic Latin.

Hora novissima, tempora pessima sunt, vigilemus," it begins with its smooth running, rhyming dactyls. The Monk regarded the form of his poem as a special inspiration of God. It was, indeed, the inspiration of a peculiar genius in literature quite distinct from any thing which we find in Greece and Rome. The severe simplicity of Greek and Roman art would disdain the accessories of rhyme. Occasionally it may occur in the Greek comedies; but classic art is uniformly characterized by a simple, statue-like wholeness, which is in broad contrast with the detailed variety and picturesque complexity which is already the developing characteristic of Teutonic genius in the mediæval world. We discover, then, in the very structure of mediæval Latin poetry a movement very different from repristination. In fact, the old classic forms were felt to be unfitted for the new life which was now active. Yet the language itself, with all its possible modifications, could not serve the new spirit, which, though bound to it for a season, must at last burst such fetters, and move gloriously onward in untrammeled freedom, generating from the depths of its own being, in its own fresh forms, the full creations of its own new and more vigorous life. Hence, from this dissonance between the genius of the age and the language used in the communication of thought, the language itself degenerates. Not in sympathy with the real tendency of surrounding history, it falls away in the very process of its use, yielding its strength to the developing language of the living

modern world. "Abdat se se in decursu temporis" (Du Cange). There was indeed no proper intermarriage of form and contents, and the tongue of Rome became barbarized even more than the mind of the barbarian became Romanized. A noble effort, made necessary by the very degeneration to which we have referred, marks the opening of the Reformation—an effort to return to the classic literature and forms as more living even, and more potent for educational purposes than the corrupted and insipid Latinity of scholastic Christendom.

While the use of the Latin, made so exclusively prevalent among the learned by the controlling influence of the Church, retarded to a considerable extent the early development of a literature fully characteristic of the Christianized Teutonic national life and in its own tongue, there was especially in England, in the formation of its own distinctive national language, a combination of unfavorable conditions in the way of such a consummation. The island of Great Britain seems to have been peculiarly one of conquest. Wave after wave of continental adventurers swept over it. The old Briton yielded to the disciplined Roman, and then gave way before the Saxons and other cognate tribes. The Anglo-Saxon, after a partial development in way of legislation and literature, was subdued by the martial Norman. Thus, in the early period, there was no time for the formation of any settled national life or speech. No sooner were the foundations fixed, than there came

> "Red ruin, and the breaking up of laws,
> The craft of kindred, and the godless hosts
> Of heathen swarming over northern seas."

The English, as a distinctive speech capable of serving the purposes of a national literature, cannot be said to have been formed before the various elements, entering by the necessities of history into its organism, were so harmonized as to be one with the developed unity of the national life. As late even as the 13th century, the English nationality was not yet settled into any distinct and permanent unity. It was moving in such direction with struggling energy. A strong organizing power was fusing the Saxon-Norman life and language into one homo-

geneous whole, opening the way thus for a truly English literature in which the national genius coming to a consciousness of itself as a unit and as possessing the combined vigor of the old Teutonic tribes, might give free utterance to its own wondrous capabilities and fulness. Already in this century the commons of England had become aroused to a sense of their own importance, and were drawn into the excited movement of the age as self-interested participants in the great change going on. A popular English national life was in its birth-throes. There were aspirations upon every side toward a free, united fatherland—and sentiments of English patriotism wide awake. The spirit then animating the barons of the realm, as finely portrayed in the Latin song written under the enthusiasm awakened by the victory at the castle of Lewes, clearly evinces this.

> "*Jam respirat Anglia, sperans libertatem,*
> Cui Dei gratia det prosperitatem !"

And again, also, when the barons were in mutual strifes, and many deserted the popular cause, another song of this period sighs the same earnest aspiration of developing English nationality.

> "Plange plorans, Anglia, plena jam dolore;
> Tristis vides tristia, languens cum mærore;
> * * * * * * * * *
> Honor nobis maximus erit laus et digna,
> *Si respondet Anglia vestra gerens signa.*"

As might be expected in a time of such commotion, such alternations of national hope and despondency as mark the 13th century, whatever of intellectual vigor the people might have, was stimulated into most intense activity; yet the literature of the century only shows that the great epoch of English life, and indeed of the whole order of Teutonic life had not yet arrived. As already remarked, in England itself no proper unity of speech, for the ends of literature at least, had yet been reached. The songs of the period, which more, perhaps, than any other writings breathe the spirit animating the heart of the people, show that there was no proper consciousness of a distinct national life. Their language is now Latin, now Anglo-Norman, now English, now French, now Provençal, and now again a

strange commingling of them all. There is, however, during the century an evident tendency toward unity. At its close, under Edward I., the English becomes much more prominent, and during the reign of Edward II. the Anglo-Norman is fast vanishing away. The age of a full, rounded English speech is at hand. The bright morning star of English poesy is nearing the horizon. It is the immortal Chaucer, in the 14th century, breathing the very life of his age, penetrating with warmest sympathy into its inmost spirit, although, and perhaps for this reason, silent in reference to its outward martial glory, conscious of its struggles after national unity, and gifted with a creative genius to mould into a harmonious whole the confused, fragmentary language which had prevailed before him,—it is the immortal Chaucer, "load-star of our language,"—"well of English undefiled," who brings in the crimson glowing dawn of English literature. As has been well said by Marsh, "he was a genuine product of the union of Saxon and Norman genius, and the first well characterized specimen of the intellectual results of a combination which has given to the world a literature so splendid and a history so noble."

Thus, under the tutoring of the Christian Church (retarding its development as the Holy Spirit saw it must be retarded to be rightly disciplined, and guided to its proper end), and by the wondrous interpenetrating energy of Christian life, that old barbaric spirit, which had hurled itself in wild license against the ramparts and legions of Rome, and with aimless fury roamed the forests and streams and ocean of the rugged north, driven ever by an undefined impulse for freedom, and which had, as under the goadings of a conscience aroused by the challenge of the Church to obedience and holiness, passed through whole reigns of assassination and blood,—that old barbaric spirit had now developed into the majesty, and beauty, and dignity, which meet us in the thought, and melody, and imagination, and faith, of Chaucer's verse. It had not yet, however, reached its proper bloom. Although a fit crisis had come for such a genius as Chaucer to arise, and although all the deep aspirations of the nation had been awakened, stimulating him to the very height

of creative energy, and warming him to a glow of sympathy with his age and country, and thus making him at once the product and interpreter of its deepest life: yet the period in which the Teutonic genius, in all its breadth, and depth, and height, was to be aroused with powers ripened into conscious, vigorous manhood, when all its inward impulses, providentially repressed for centuries, should burst forth into marvellous activity, as though from beneath the fabled Ash some virgin Skuld, or weird Sister, or some supernatural spirit, who had guarded and guided the destiny of the old barbaric world, had now brought it to the golden threshold, and thrown open the hitherto closed portals, and spread out glittering before its vision the vast future of its history, giving to it an awakened consciousness, to some extent at least, of its glory, and of the tremendous problems which were to challenge its solution, and which it is now solving in the midst of perplexities and fearful anxieties, but with a faith ever fresh, and an energy ever young,—yet this period, we repeat, had not yet come. The age of Chaucer and Wiclif was but an anticipation of it in England, a dawning presage and prophecy which found reality and fulfilment only in the sixteenth century.

This was the century of great events,—the fulness of time for the Teutonic world. All its vast energy, hitherto under a discipline which, while at first necessary and beneficial, had in the end become a tyranny holding in check all proper development, now, self-urged and breaking from fetters, opened a way for its own freer and more distinctive activity. All the tendencies which had been at work during the preceding centuries, now reached their crisis. The long growth of the middle ages now came to its bloom, and the opening reality of the modern world confronted mankind. Not only in the sphere of religion did this epoch of history manifest its presence, but in every sphere of human life. A new world of thought and action stretched out before mankind as vast and as untried as the continent of wonders which had just met the vision of Columbus beyond the ocean. A new method of intellectual intercourse, through the invention of printing, opened the way for a commerce of thought more grand than that to which the new pas-

sage to the Indies around the Cape of Good Hope called the nations. Indeed, all the forces, physical and metaphysical, which can be active in history, seemed to have concentrated to make the sixteenth century a crisis of immense significance,—a great world-epoch, whose fulness of meaning no mind can yet fathom; for the agitations which it aroused, the broad antagonisms which it brought into conflict, the world-powers which it jostled against each other in its mighty movement, have not reached any full or satisfactory settlement. The modern Teutonic world, in all the breadth and grandeur of its present history, has not yet wrought out a full solution to the tremendous problems which challenging awakened it to such a sense and to such a marvellous exercise of its capacities.

At such an epoch of history, then, it were strange, indeed, if the national mind of England should not have been startled into activity,—if the fountains of its thought, now agitated to their very depths, and welling up, should not send their gushing fulness into the noisy current of the age. All the various elements through which the spirit of a people finds utterance for itself, are so intimately and organically related, that whatever influences one, must, at the same time, affect all. These elements, in fact, are but so many forms in which the national spirit, as the underlying substance, becomes conscious of itself; and as this spirit moves on in the development of the world's history, these elements form all the while the necessary coefficients of its process. They are thus in their very essence and object one, and inseparably conjoined in the national life. It is impossible, therefore, that a nation should pass through any great epoch of its history,—any revolution which reaches and stirs up the very deeps of its own moral being, without giving evidence of the same universally, in all the various forms which are, as we have said, but the constituent elements of its own life. Philosophy, art, religion, and literature, no less than politics, are so many voices with which the spirit of the age utters itself.

When Greece, *e. g.*, more especially centring in Athens, had been aroused for self-preservation against the invading millions of Asia, and had in this crisis of her history become conscious

of her power, and was fired with enthusiasm by the heroic deeds of Marathon, Thermopylæ, and Salamis, in which all the latent strength, and distinctive force of her national life had been called into activity, *then* the dramatic genius of Æschylus, animated with all the glowing vigor of his fatherland, and rejoicing in her victory, came upon the stage to breathe, in immortal verse, the fresh martial pomp, the proud glory, the awakened enthusiasm, and the majestic heroism of the Grecian spirit. Everywhere, throughout his writings, as in the Persæ, the energy of will is arrayed against the might of flesh, the small, ideal Greece, against the vast, physical Asia. Spirit all the while illumines and conquers; and in the Prometheus, as has been said, we have "the magnificent impersonation of mind struggling against circumstances, intellect against force, providence against fate." Just at that epoch, as any one may see,—that turning point, when Greece had reached the fullest consciousness of her own distinctive genius, in contrast, and by direct conflict with the Oriental spirit, we have a literature developed, especially in dramatic form, which shows at once, in the general way now mentioned, the immense influence and significance of such historical crisis. The spirit of Greece, in its broad contrast with that of the East, finds a voice of utterance, and comes to a full consciousness of itself, not only in the way of deeds on fields of blood, but in the creations of genius, and on the Athenian stage. Here it finds an embodiment for itself no less real or significant, and no less directly related to the historical crisis through which it passed.

Now in a still broader sense the Reformation formed a world-historical epoch,—the great crisis, as already intimated, of the Teutonic national life. In its profoundest deeps this life was now agitated. Currents which had been moving beneath the course of history for ages, and imperceptibly guiding and controlling it, now rushed to the surface, sweeping before them a thousand obstacles hitherto supposed immovable,—snatching, like Simoïs, and rolling under their waves the shields and stout bodies of men. The most central energy of human life, that of religion, was now in intensest activity. The Teutonic tribes

had long before bowed before Christianity as this had confronted them in the Catholic Church. Now, however, the period had come when their own peculiar genius, developed and elevated as it was permeated by the higher life of Christianity, was to assert itself in all the organizations of history, and make way for the evolution of its own rich contents in the world. The more it was now repressed by the determined resistance of Mediæval Catholicism, the more resolutely it entered into conflict, standing forth with its sense of freedom,—its moral spirit averse to every form of arbitrary authority, now in heroic martyrdom, and now in most solemn protest. It is impossible to picture to ourselves the ferment which was going on,—the tumult of contending thoughts, the rapid concentration of sympathies,—the fierce conflicts of re-organization, which the Roman Catholic Church, as then conditioned, seems to have had no power to control. It is now no longer wild barbaric tribes hurling themselves against the walls of lofty Rome, but a Christianized and grand national life aroused to find a proper sphere for its own consciousness of freedom, and room for its own distinctive apprehension of Christian life and truth to embody itself.

Now this whole movement, this wide, universal ferment of feeling and thought, this uncontrollable impulse of freedom bursting the fetters of the old system which bound it, this rising into view of a new, moral world, inspiring the hopes and deepening the aspirations of mankind,—this reformation and reorganization of the past under the irresistible impulse of a sense of independence in every department of life,—all this inspired as never before the English national mind, and inwove itself into the very flesh and blood of English life.

England also, especially in the time of Queen Elizabeth, was most favorably conditioned with its settled polity, with its national sympathies, and with its language already moulded into poetic form, to give utterance in way of literature to this reawakened energy,—this wondrous elevation of life. Long before the 16th century here, as elsewhere throughout the whole compass of Teutonic Christendom, there had been the beginnings,—the forming tendencies which reached out historically

to such a crisis. Balmes may say that the fact of Protestantism attracted the attention of Europe "like a clap of thunder," and the statement may have a measure of truth so far as this particular phase of the crisis is concerned; but before the thunder itself of his figure could sound, the bulk of clouds had been gradually forming in the moist trembling atmosphere, and electric contents gathering from the heated earth, until the very heavens were surcharged and ready for the storm. Energy of Christian thought and purpose had been developing for ages, measuring the limits of its strength, but now it came to a full consciousness of itself in power, and was drawn by the very force of history into self-determining, independent activity. In England the opposition to the Papal power was not merely a religious but a political opposition. There was an English sense of national independence, which as combined with the pervading desire for freedom of religious thought, only excited a more earnest reforming activity. This had shown itself quite distinctly even as far back as the 12th and 13th centuries. The mercenary spirit of the bishops is most caustically dealt with in a song of the time of King John. The song is headed, "Planctus super Episcopis." Its punning railery indicates how wide spread the dissatisfaction of the age must have been:

"Sic lucrum Lucam superat
Marco Marcam praeponderat,
Et librae librum subjicit."

Not only the Bishops but the Pope and Cardinals of Rome come in for their full share. One song in its satiric drollery says, "the Pope, if we come to the truth of the matter, has his name from the fact that whatever others have, he alone will suck the *pap;* or if you like to apocopate a French word, "*pay, pay,*" saith the word, if you wish to obtain any thing. The Pope begs, the brief begs, the bull begs, the gate begs, the cardinal begs, the cursor begs. * * O, you full purses, come to Rome; Rome has choice medicine for costive pockets."

No doubt, as is natural in the cause of such satirical writings, the evil is greatly exaggerated because brought so exclusively into view. We have not referred to these songs, however, as

historical testimony against the papacy, but as so many examples illustrating the statement which we feel perfectly safe in making, viz., that nearly all the popular literature of that age originated in at least a negative spirit of reform, evincing a prevailing popular dissatisfaction with the reigning order of things especially in the Church.

But in the period to which we have referred, whose literary character was chiefly represented by Wiclif and Chaucer, a more positive and national spirit, allied to that of the Reformation, manifested itself, and anticipations of an approaching new order of things were eagerly indulged. In his tract, "*the last age of the Church*," Wiclif breathes forth his mournful sense of the wide spread corruption in the Church, and of the necessity of a radical reformation, and looks for consolation only in the near approach of Christ's second coming. But he rested not in mere negative complaint. With a boldness, more earnest from his deep conviction of what the age needed, he entered into conflict, intrepidly defended the English nation against the arbitrary claims of Pope Urban V., and in the end placed the Holy Scriptures before his countrymen in their own mother-tongue, a stimulus to their religious thought, and a monument of his own Christian labor. Wiclif's whole literary life was essentially Protestant, and is closely allied in its earnest freedom of thought with the movement of the 16th century. Chaucer also, although in a different sphere, and with the reformatory spirit toned down by his own exquisite humor, shows himself in full inward sympathy with the fearless independence of the persecuted Wiclif. This is evident in his beautiful dramatic contrasts between the "*poure persone*" and the "*Pardonere*," between the "*Prioresse*," the monk, and the "*Frier*." The poor parson was rich of holy thought and work, preaching truly Christ's gospel, giving his substance to the poor, and a noble example to all of practising first and afterwards teaching:

> "And ran not unto London, to Seint Poules,
> To seken him a chanterie for soules,
> But dwelt at home, and kepte wel his fold."

The Pardonere was a travelling pedler of indulgencies, "streit comen from the Court of Rome," with his wondrous relics, a pillow case which he called the Virgin's veil, and a morsel of the sail of Saint Peter's ship. He kept before him in his lap his wallet,

"Bret-ful of pardon come from Rome all hote"

—a noble ecclesiast, and

"Wel coude he rede a lesson or a storie,
But alder best he sang an *offertorie*."

The monk, "he was a lord ful fat and in good point," and in hunting and leaping his horses, showed himself "a manly man, to ben an abbot able." The wanton merry Friar was a Limitour—licensed to beg, a wondrous solemn man, the very post of his order at his swindling profession:

"For though a widewe hadde but a shoe,
(So plesant was his *In principio,*)
Yet wold he have a ferthing or he went."

Chaucer did not, like Wiclif, enter into any serious conflicts in way of reform; but opposition to the false tendencies of an age, as we well know, may manifest itself not only in an earnest polemic, like that of the "*Anxious Bench*," in our own time, but also with equal force in the naïve humor of an essay headed "*the antipodes, or the world reversed.*" The literary labors of Wiclif and Chaucer thus formed a base in language and sympathies of thought for the period of the Reformation, and, as before stated, helped to put the English mind in favorable condition to give utterance, in forms of literature, to the re-awakened energy, the wondrous elevation of life, which characterized the 16th century.

The time intervening between Chaucer and the Reformation has little to characterize it in the way of literature. The 14th century seems to have exhausted the strength of thought and imagination which its national enthusiasm and struggles had called into activity in England, and the century following is one of seeming intellectual stagnation. But the vigor of English

character was still there, though not active in the way of literature, and when the Reformation, with its cluster of world-stirring events, had dawned, the spirit of the nation rose now to the very height of its enthusiasm, and to the fullest consciousness of its strength; and upon the high vantage-ground already gained by the literary development going before, it raised that massive structure of epic and dramatic romance, which has ever since gained the admiration of the world. Hazlitt, in this connection, has eloquently said: "Germany first broke the spell of misbegotten fear, and gave the watchword; but England joined the shout, and echoed it back with her island voice from her thousand cliffs and craggy shores, in a longer and a louder strain. With that cry the genius of Great Britain rose, and threw down the gauntlet to the nations."

The whole movement of the Reformation, as it brought into full historical activity the vast strength and peculiar genius of Teutonic life, and stirred up the English mind with a fulness of impulse, and a dignity of motive, never before realized, enshrined itself in the bold, gothic magnificence, in the everywhere manifest sense of power and independence, in the fresh exuberance of awakened aspirations, and in the deep, earnest, moral tone of the writings of Spenser, and Marlowe, and Webster, and Decker, and others, and above all, the "*myriad-minded*" Shakspeare. Time does not allow us to make an analysis of the writings of any one of the men just mentioned, having especially in view the influence exerted by that historical culture, in the bosom of which they lived and wrote; and we are convinced that any attempt to portray, by detailed quotations, the presence of such influence, would prove unsatisfactory. Indeed, it is not in this way that it can be portrayed. Not in fragments here and there, nor in definite references to the Reformation itself, but in the whole underlying spirit, in the tone and atmosphere of the literature, its wondrous independence of thought, its immense extent and scope, its vivid sense of individuality, its reverence for what belongs to the free moral nature of man, and in its warm sympathy with the national life in its struggles and victory, does the crisis of the Reformation show

the presence and fulness of its power. The whole pageantry of mediæval knight-errantry, with its legends of wonderful encounters, still glows in the romantic splendor of Spenser's allegory, but as the departed day in the crimson of the west. We feel that it is past and gone, yet wondrously brought back again with the same freshness of reality, but with a clear apprehension now of an inward moral import, as it is made to shadow forth in his verse the more earnest knighthood of our religious nature, the encounters and conflicts of virtues in their formation and perfecting. The impulse given to his genius by the age, is seen also in the freedom and almost infinite diversity of his invention. The ideal fairy land in which he revels, is but a poetic counterpart of that new world of possibilities and hopes which the era of the Reformation brought home to the hearts of men. We mean not to say that in Spenser and Shakspeare, and others, the efficient creative power was not in their own genius; but there were conditions surrounding their inspiration, unfoldings of soul in a crisis that so intensely engrossed every interest of life, which not only awakened the energy of their imagination, but formed, as it were, the external inlets through which they entered into the deep mysteries of the human heart, and so boldly brought out into light the hidden moral instincts of mankind—the outward revelation, in fine, in the power of apprehending and interpreting which, the inspiration of their genius manifested itself. The Reformation, as a conditioning impulse,—an underlying motive power of genius, continued itself in England in the literature of the Elizabethan age. As, after the great battle of the Huns under Attila, in which the contending forces became so enraged in mutual slaughter, the still unsatisfied spirits of the slain, according to tradition, renewed the contest in the air: so the overwhelming fulness of excitement, and conflict, and thought, which the Reformation produced, could not satisfy itself with political and theological warfare only, but must renew itself in an ideal world,—the airy realm of epic and dramatic romance.

It may be said, indeed, that the whole literary development of the modern world is conditioned by the movement of the six-

teenth century. As that crisis occasioned a great schism in the Christian Church, and gave birth to the distinct organism of Protestantism over against Roman Catholicism, it now shows its historical import,—its fulness of contents, in just this fact that the main current of history has been ever since under what may be termed Protestant control. Wherever the old Teutonic life has been preserved in language and mode of thought, as in Germany, and England, and America, there Protestantism has shown its strength and sympathy in the spheres of politics, and science, and philosophy, and literature. What a stretch of desert would there be in the literature of the past three hundred years, if the fresh fountains and streams of Protestant thought had been dried up! It may be said, however, that without Protestantism, the same intellectual vigor, and wealth of literature, would have marked the development of Teutonic life, and this, too, while under Rome, without the serious consequences which now confront the world in the form of endless ecclesiastical divisions and a wide-spread rationalism and infidelity. It is easy to assume what history might have been; but it is our duty to look at it as it has been, and is. Responsibility cannot be waved aside with the comforting after-thought that such a result might have been accomplished. Why did not Roman Catholicism hold within its own control what it had kept for so many centuries under its own discipline? Why, when such a crisis of history had arrived, the very force of which had been accumulating in its own bosom, did it prove itself unable to apprehend it, and guide it, and mould it, within the sphere of its own organization? Why, as the guardian of history, did it fail to perceive the movement of the ages, and the rising storm, and thus come to allow its own Christian communities to be startled by such a sudden clap of thunder from the moral world? The weakness, and want of proper discernment and Catholicity, manifest themselves just here. The vast world of moral activities, the richest, blossoming vigor of Christianized Teutonic life, rising beyond the limits of the Church system, which had been of such vast account in the ages before, and developing wants and dangers, too, which that system could neither meet nor properly guard,

without it should itself, in some way, rise to the magnitude of the epoch confronting it, the blossoming vigor of Christianized Teutonic life, we repeat, was held in and forced to break the fetters, and bear with it the main energy of history, in place of finding in the Papacy, as it ought to have found, a heart of sympathy, and a living expansion of thought, and a catholicity of power which could hold, and cherish, and direct it. It is true, the fearless independence of thought which the crisis engendered, and which is infused, we may say, into every sphere of modern activity which, in the field of literature, startles us in the Faustus of Marlowe, which overwhelms us in the wondrous unveilings of soul in Hamlet and Macbeth, and which meets us again in the Puritanic earnestness and boldness of conception of Milton's epic of the supernatural (we may call it), where we are confronted with celestial and infernal parliaments, and compelled to feel that the great rebel Satan is an Archangel, though fallen,—this fearless independence of thought, reaching not only into poetry, but into philosophy, and politics, and religion, may, and indeed does, involve dangers, and imposes upon the Protestant world an immense responsibility. But is it any less dangerous for men to shrink back into a forced slavishness of thought, and to rest upon an authority which comes to no inward self-authentication in the moral nature, than for them to tremble, it may be, on the very verge of skepticism, in the effort to bring the absolute truth of Divine Revelation, and the truth of reason and of history into harmony in their consciousness? The past, at least, as characterized for three hundred years by such freedom of thought, and clustering with the dangers thereof, is behind us, and cannot be annulled; and who dare indulge the fearful incredulity of thinking that this whole compass of Protestant history has been retarding only that process through which the Divine idea of the world is reaching out towards its realization? What may be the issue in the future, it is, perhaps, vain to conjecture. Whether another nation or race may arise, which shall take up into itself the exhausted vigor of the Teutonic, as this did that of the old Greek and Roman world, and adorn history with another literature and order of life yet more

grand than all before, or whether the two great conflicting tendencies of the present historical world shall come together in a unity of faith, and religious life, and organization more real and glorious from their temporary and necessary divergence, or whether already, under Christianity, the world's season of probation is drawing to a close, with no other great crisis awaiting it than that of judgment in the midnight, it may be, of its antagonisms and confusions, this who can tell, or would be profited by knowing?

ART. III.—NORMAL HUMANITY; OR MAN IN THE LIGHT OF THE DIVINE IDEA.

BY REV. SAMUEL H. GIESY, A.M., PHILADELPHIA.

The age is deeply stirred by the attempted solution of the gravest problems; by none more deeply than the one we have ventured to place at the head of this article, involving as it does the question of man's place in creation. Kant said there were two things he could not sufficiently admire: "The *starry heavens* above him, and the *Moral Law* within his own heart." This saying, worthy a great philosopher, puts the work of creation before us in this twofold order—the constitution of Nature, and the constitution of Man.

The problem of Man is the problem of the universe. His advent was the pre-existent idea of creation—that on which the whole process was based, and came at length to full apprehension in his wonderful capacity of self-apprehension and the apprehension of God. The great outlying universe of matter—the vast macrocosm—becomes alone intelligent and intelligible in what is vastly superior, the inlying universe of mind—Man, aptly called the microcosm. The constitution of nature looks to the constitution of man as its proper complement; and to realize his normal character he must stand in right relations not only to God, but also to nature.

The word *normal* must determine the proper order of our thoughts. Coming from the Latin *normalis*, itself from *norma*,

a carpenter's square or rule, an instrument for making or testing a right angle, *normal*, in its actual derivation, denotes what is right and regular, what fully harmonizes with the original intention. Only from the stand-point of the normal can anything be pronounced abnormal, *i. e.*, not according to its primal constitution and purpose. God's idea of Man realized, is the true ideal of Manhood.

NORMAL HUMANITY.

The Divine end in a created entity is approximately determined by its own constitution, and the place assigned it in the order of nature. The *pre-eminent* place man occupies in the scale of being, will determine the Divine idea of Manhood.

The great Pyramid of Egypt still stands the architectural wonder of the world. Starting from a broad base, it steadily and grandly reaches upward to its summit and crown. Thus in remote art, we have the mechanical embodiment of what, under its grandest form, is seen in the structure of the universe. It is, whether intended or not, a true copy of divine things. That monumental receptacle of royal remains—the shrine of departed human glory—was made after the pattern given in nature, where everything, through a vast series of gradations, is observed converging towards a certain point—Creation's self-conscious apex—Man.

The divine order of nature is of this pyramidal form. Starting in the broad base of inorganic matter, it stretches continually upward, more and more grandly, through the indeterminate pre-historic periods. One kingdom rises above another, but not in any independent and isolated way. The one immediately above rests in the one below as its necessary groundwork; the one below is gathered up and carried forward in the one above, as both its condition and constituent element. Organic, vitalized matter in its first form, vegetation, roots itself in inorganic matter, and takes it up into its own higher composition. This root-life is in order to the higher fruit-life. The lower thus is never complete in itself. It reaches towards and finds its ultimate meaning in the higher. Its end is reached in making way for the higher, of which it is the anticipation and adumbra-

tion. Under this general view, however, nature is not so many distinct and separate orders arbitrarily appearing, like the links of a chain susceptible of infinite extension. The order of nature is one—the unity of a common end. Through its progressive stages, there is felt to be the presence of one all-pervading purpose, the power of one ruling thought—the inward endeavor toward the realization of the most perfect organism, which, through the ascending series of vital forces and forms, it is steadily approaching, but has no power in itself to actualize.

The material forms necessarily the broad basis of all that follows, yet it is not related to that standing directly above it as cause to effect. The organic includes and carries forward the inorganic, yet there is no force resident in the lower to produce the higher, though the higher, so to speak, is its flowering. Matter has no power to get beyond itself, to originate plant-life, the first form of organized and vitalized nature. There cannot be in natural results what there is not in natural forces; the effect cannot be greater than the cause. The germ cannot develop more than what is in it potentially. The process of development puts in nothing new, it only actualizes what was there previously in possibility. Multiply the number one never so frequently by itself, it never gets beyond one. Multiply the natural by the natural, it never rises into the ethical. Instinct in the animal is a prophecy of reason in the sphere of the human; but instinct multiplied by instinct never rises into the dignity and majesty of mind. The difference is not one of degree simply, but of kind. The mind-force of the brute is not one in nature with man's power of abstract reasoning.

In the different orders of nature there is no inherent power of transition. The lower forms foreshadow and are at length culminated in, but they cannot transmute themselves into other and higher forms. The diamond is a prophecy of the plant, and the plant of the animal feeding upon it; but by no process of self-evolution can the brilliant diamond attain to the living, and, therefore, superior beauty of the rose; or the pencilled glory of the rose to the instinct and winged swiftness of the bee; or the instinct of the bee, the same now as in the beginning, to

the self-conscious and self-determining activity of man. The difference is principial and perpetual. Although man embraces in his constitution all the lower orders, yet is he generically different from them, and, in no sense, their necessary resultant simply. He is a new creation.

In this ascending scale of being, although nature carried along the prophecy of the most perfect and complete organism, yet it did not carry in its womb the generative power of such an organism, finding its full realization in the human body. Physically man stands in nature, but for that reason he is not the offspring of mere nature. Physically man is allied to the brute, but for that reason he is not the offspring of the brute. Standing amid the same outward circumstances of existence, there is the same necessity for similar organs of respiration, digestion, vision, and locomotion. There is, therefore, nothing derogatory to man in such physical alliance to animals, nor any room for the humiliating thought of his bestial descent. This self-degrading guess at human origin—man springing from the brute—we have, in distant art, pictured in the Egyptian sphinx, the head of man resting on the body of an animal. This sculptured fancy has been wrought out in the famous development-theory of Darwin and Huxley, who see, in the recently-found gorilla, the connecting link between the monkey and man. With no little amount of learning they have endeavored to write up this theory of man's life being only the development of the brutal life below him, but it is entitled to no kind of favor. However contentedly these men seem to have settled down to such a beggarly parentage, we confess to an irrepressible aspiration to a nobler ancestry.

Man, towards whom the whole creation looked from the start, is not, in his erect form, his noble carriage, his massive brow on which the power of thought is stamped, and his intelligence-beaming eye, the realized potentiality of the ape. Given two hands, with an upright posture, he is not the development of the pedimana-foot-handed tribe. There is, in every respect, an immeasurable distance between them—an impassable chasm. With a countenance lifted heavenward, he is incomparably superior to the whole brutal world beside.

"While the mute creation downward bend
Their gaze, and to their earthly mother tend,
Man looks aloft, and with erected eyes
Beholds his own hereditary skies."

The Greek appellation for man expresses the dignity of his nature, in external appearance exalted so immeasurably above the brutes. By them he was fitly called ὁ ἄνθρωπος, from ὁ ἄνω ἀθρῶν—the uplooking one; showing that not earth, but heaven, is his home; not time, but eternity, his true destiny; not sense, but God, the end of his being. In the unparalleled dignity of his form, the inward struggle of life toward a common end—the *conatus vitæ* of nature—reaches its culmination and climax. Under this outward aspect already, he stands at the summit of creation's vast pyramid—the crown physically of all below him, and, in the mental and moral endowments belonging to him, the image of a yet answering higher, the reflection here, we may say, of God, in whose presence and eternal favor his whole being reaches ultimately its original destiny. "He is," says another, "the true ideal of the world's universal life, the last aim and scope of the whole natural creation. He is the fulfilment of all its prophecies, the key to its mysteries, the exposition of its deepest and most hidden sense." *

This grand physical mark of distinction, if there were nothing besides, shows man to have been, not a development from a lower order, but an original creation. This is brought out clearly enough in the Mosaic account. Each step in this series of gradations is represented as a new creation—a fresh movement from the creative centre—the majestic step of the great Creator moving gradually, moving grandly onward in the vast work. Each of those creative æons marks a distinct and grander manifestation of omnific power. The incomparable glory of this crowning act appears from this, that the formation of man, unlike the other creations, is a work of forethought and conference. After a solemn pause, as it were, in the majestic work, there follows this oracular utterance, "Let *us* make man in *our*

* The Wonderful Nature of Man. Rev. J. W. Nevin, D.D., *Mer. Rev.*, 1859, p. 319.

image, after *our* likeness." The other orders of nature, it is clear enough from the biblical narrative, came simply by a creative command, thus, "Let the earth bring forth grass;" "Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life;" "Let the earth bring forth the living creature." In the case of man, however, no such command is given, "Let the earth bring forth man." So far from this being the case, the impression is left on the thoughtful mind, that God's own hand, humanly speaking, was directly engaged in the formation of man's body. The Bible thus represents the advent of man to have been principially supernatural—the introduction of something new—an act standing by itself. And it would seem that the whole material creation, always reaching towards the realization of this Divine Idea, came in it to its glorious rest. For six thousand years there has been nothing beyond. Here the creative movement, according to the Divine act and word, staid, "And He rested on the seventh day from all His work."

But physical nature under this, its climactic glory, does not contain its own end. The dignity and perfection of the human body look to a purpose beyond itself. At immense cost we rear grand cathedrals. Their lofty domes, their decorated walls, their holy of holies in which is concentred the whole force of the sacred idea, speak of a purpose looking steadily beyond the outward and material grandeur of the place. They are the earthly habitations of Jehovah—the shrine of the Infinite—which He has promised to fill with His glorious presence. The human body was designed to be the living temple of God—the shrine of more than mere natural forces—heavenly powers under the form of mental and moral, and therefore eternal, aptitudes. And because it was designed for the glorious epiphany of mind, the temple of the soul, the shrine of the spiritual, the habitation of reason and will, the residence of personality, under the mighty hand of God, it takes the most perfect mould.

The structure of an animal at once defines and determines its place in the scale of being. The perfection of the human body, determining man's place to be the topmost in the whole order of nature, declares, with the solemn emphasis of a divine fiat, the

kind of life required. With his feet planted on the earth from which he sprang, and his head lifted skyward, in mute but impressive prophecy leading the way to the glory to which he should ever aspire; his eye, like a polished mirror, reflecting the image of his own divinity; his massive forehead revealing the stamp of greatness belonging to no other creature on earth; his hands adapted to the lordship assigned him, the crowned and sceptred ruler of the world he inhabits; his tongue formed for intelligent speech, nature's articulation, giving utterance to its silent and incessant worship, he was divinely intended to meet a destiny answerable in all regards to the lofty height to which he has thus been raised.

The primacy of man, however, rests on *something higher than this bodily perfection.* Nature, even in this last result, would itself be a truncated work—a pyramid left without cap-stone, denoting, like broken columns in our cemeteries, an incomplete thing—if it were not met here by what transcends the merely physical. Man is more than the highest order in the animal kingdom. He has a body; but he is not pure body. He is a spirit; but he is not pure spirit. He is not all animal, and so wholly brutal; he is not pure spirit, and so wholly divine. He is a spirit-embodied being—the form under which the mutual intersection of the physical and the ethical holds. And these holding in his person a living unity, are mutually interacting, and so modifying the whole order of his life.

This conjunction of spirit and matter comes forward in the first creational act—the Spirit brooding over the original chaos, giving form and life to "the earth that was without form, and void." It comes forward more prominently and permanently in the topmost act of the whole process—the Spirit enduing man with life, and the body which that quickening spirit takes. The one part of man's being comes from the ground, the other directly from the Uncreated Spirit. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." There is here a trinity of powers in living unity—threefoldness in true one-

ness—the life and purpose one, the parts triplex. Between these really distinct and dissimilar elements there is, however, no yawning chasm, no impassable gulf, but a real aptitude, a true homogeneity. This appears especially in the point of union itself—the soul, or psychical element of our being. The pneumatic is our base in God; the somatic is our base in the cosmical; the psychical is the connecting, mediating principle. The pneumatic includes only the moral powers, conscience and will, and generally the aptitudes and capacities for the absolute and infinite. While these have in them nothing intellectual, they acquire the intellectual in union with the psychical, through the reason, which is the medium and means of union between the knowing and the willing.

True Ethics and sound Theology must be rooted and grounded, on their anthropological side, in a proper Psychology. Errors in the two former, are errors imported from the latter. "A sound Psychology is the basis of a sound Theology." If our Psychology be faulty, both our Ethics and Theology must be wrong in the application of their principles to man in his abnormal condition. The theological controversies which raged with so much fury in the early ages of the Church, originated in the failure to maintain the true biblical division of man's nature. Augustine was the first to suggest the dichotomy of man, and, introducing confusion into the sphere of Psychology, immense difficulties and disputes sprang up in the sphere of Theology, in which, to this day, the whole Western Church has been involved. The heathen philosopher Plato, in this particular, was far in advance of the great theologian of the West. He maintained the trichotomy of man. He did not, and, of course, could not rise to the biblical idea. He had not the gift of inspiration, nor yet the fruit of inspiration to start from and guide him in his philosophic inquiries. He approached as near the truth as the unaided intellect could, but failed to reach the true conception of man's tripartite constitution. He made the pure intellect, instead of the spirit, the faculty of first truths.

St. Paul's conception of the constitution of man, is tricho-

tomic. He puts in our nature the organ and function of a *tertiam partem*—a separate faculty πνεῦμα, or spirit, the faculty of God-consciousness, the seat of all spiritual aptitudes, the capacity of knowing and owning our relation to God. According to this Pauline division, we have in man three orders of powers, corporeal, intellectual, and spiritual, answering to the Greek, *το σῶμα, καὶ ἡ ψυχή, καὶ το πνεῦμα.*

The distinctive mark of man is a *reasonable soul*—i. e. *the power of self-consciousness*—the distinction of the Me from all that is not Me, the full apprehension of his relation to what stands below him and above him, and the moral duties necessarily growing out of this relationship. Personality is only possible in the sphere of reason and will, and its highest province is the power of self-determination. This is man's property alone. There is nothing like it in the order of life going before. It is in this that man rises to the true nobility of his nature—his likeness to God. By the "image of God," in which man was created, no physical likeness, of course, is intended, as God's being cannot be conceived as holding in any material form. Man is the copy of God in those mental and spiritual powers, which are in common to Him and to us. The phrase points to the Divine pattern and archetype, after which man's mental and spiritual nature was fashioned—reason and will in their highest and freest action being attributes of God. The highest thing that may be said of man is, that he is, like God, a thinking and willing being.

The prophecies of mind-force we meet already in the animal world. But mere instinct, or the dumb show even of putting things together, as when a dog, hit with a stone, is sure to make off as soon as another assailant stoops to pick up a stone, is not mind. Reasoning by association, and the power of abstract reasoning, are wider apart than the dimness of dawn and the perfection of the day, though the one be the prophecy and pledge of the full-orbed splendor of the other. The sagacity of a dog is far from being one in kind with the intellect of a child, putting words into sentences, and giving intelligent expression

to his thoughts and his wants.* It is in possessing the power of thought—the power of externalizing the inner world of self—that stamps man with his likness to God. He has thoughts "which he is enabled to realize." He thinks earnestly, thinks profoundly, thinks efficiently. He penetrates nature by the power of thought; controls nature; annihilates nature; rises superior to nature. He spans broad oceans with a wire, and brings distant continents within speaking proximity. He makes the distant in time, as well as the distant in space, nigh. He thinks of eternity; he thinks of God, than which there are no sublimer thoughts;—a fact which reveals the consciousness of an eternal destiny, and a moral accountability which, in his deepest intuitions, links him to the bar of God.

Thought looks to action; completes and embodies itself in action. The highest style of action is self-determined; action proceeding, not from a force without, but a power within—action autonomically ordered—the decision of the free, untrammelled will. The noblest prerogative of man is this power of voluntary action—personal movement from the very centre of his being. As a self-determining power beyond, or outside of God, the human will is the greatest and highest of all creations, greater than all systems of worlds, universes beyond universes. It is in this feature of his being, that man comes to his fullest resemblance to God—nearest like God Himself—centring in himself the wholeness of the Divine image; the mirror of Divine self-activity; "his own master by means of his will. For the highest thing that can be said of God is, that He is His own master." †

Man being tripartite in the constitution of his person, he is tripartite also in the *offices and relations* which spring out of this order. Holding an intermediate position between the sen-

---

* "The animal has sensations, notions, impulses, &c.; but thought, properly so called, belongs to man alone." Dr. Luthardt. *Fund. Truths*, p. 122.

† Dr. Luthardt. *Fundamental Truths*, p. 124.

sible and the supersensible, in the presence of the world of sense he is that in which the whole comes to its deepest significance and divinest service, in the presence of God he is His image, the reflection of Himself. The human body stands directly in the sovereignty of the head, which at the same time gathers up in itself the last sense of the whole system. Man, as the head of the material creation, gathering up in himself the meaning and end of all things, is

The Prophet of the universe. A prophet is a teacher, the revealer of mysteries into which he has penetrated, speaking out the divine, which is always the real and true purpose of things. Unconscious nature can only reach its true interpretation in the self-conscious spirit of man. The material universe, in all its magnitude and magnificence, would be actually meaningless and useless apart from the mastery of man. A world beautified, garnished, and fitted up in the most gorgeous style, but all these outward beauties, apart from him, would have to be set down as a wanton waste of glory—like flowers,

> "Born to blush unseen,
> And waste their sweetness on the desert air."

Without a comprehending eye, the mirror of a comprehending soul, it would be as though the night had spread its thickest mantle over the face of nature. Without an intelligent ear, into which the melodious voices, making up the chorus of the universe, enter, and are themselves re-echoed in the human voice, in the form of intelligent speech, it would be as though unbroken silence reigned throughout the universe. Man is the echo of the universe.* Dr. Rauch calls his "personality the great, beautiful, and complete *bell*, that announces everything." Hebrew, in the massive structure of its letters, is unreadable without vowel points. Man's creation is the vowel-pointing of the universe; comes in him and through him to articulate utterance.

---

* "The whole external world finds an echo in the little world within, and is reproduced in the various forms of *artistic delineation*—in painting, music, poetry; and, as the world's intellectual reflection illumined, beautified, spiritualized, transfigured, surpasses the outward world of reality." Dr. Luthardt's *Fund. Truths*, p. 128.

Man is also the King of the universe. The world is for his dominion. He is to subjugate nature; make it subserve its true destiny in furthering ends beyond itself. According to the original announcement, nature in all its orders and powers is to serve his will,-but his will as itself moving in the bosom of the Divine will. He is to be its master by showing himself the master, first of all, of himself. By virtue of the constitutional* endowment of his own nature, his knowledge of nature steadily becomes the rod of his power. If nature is not to be one wild waste of creative energy, it must be comprehended and employed. The arcana of nature opens to the penetrating mind of man. By it he pronounces the magic "Sesame," that drags to light its profoundest secrets, and subjugates its subtlest forces to his guiding will. Weak and impotent before them, yet is he neither backward nor afraid to yoke them as manageable and well-trained steeds to swiftest chariots, making them drive the wheels of commerce with almost breathless rapidity over iron tracks fettering distant countries to each other by a community of interests, and pouring through submerged cables his lightning dispatches, which show him to be mightier than the things he uses.

But man's full position in nature is not reached either in the sphere of knowledge or power—knowing simply the uses of natural forces, and harnessing them, as the horse to the wagon, to his higher service. Man stands before God the mouthpiece and master of nature, but as well its mirror, reflecting back to God, as the placid surface of the lake the skies bending over it, the bright image of His own glory. *He is the High Priest of nature.* A priesthood is a sacred order among men mediating the human and the divine, gathering up the homage and worship of others, and laying it a sanctified offering on the altar of God. Thus man, as the High Priest of nature, is to sanctify all that enters into his mind in the form of knowledge and power, of thought and will, and, consecrating himself by a free

* This *constitutional* dominion of nature is thus indicated: "The *fear* of you and the *dread* of you shall be upon every beast of the earth; . . . into your hands are they delivered." Gen. ix. 2.

and intelligent act to God, present, in the same act and on the same altar, the whole universe to God, who formed it for His own glory. A consecrated being, standing in this outer court of the Almighty's glory, the vestibule to heaven's more perfect praise, with the majestic song of the universe—the multitudinous birds leading the soprano with their matin notes modulated by the hum of the insect world, and the roar of the cataract echoed in the roll of the deep-throated thunder coming in, like the great swell of the organ—pouring into his ear, he comes forward, and, before God the great Creator of all, whom, in his intelligence and will, he images, gives devotional voice to this music of nature. Only in such priestly employment—a holy service in which he represents the world before God, enthroned in purity and light—do we meet the Divine idea of man—that "*higher destiny*, in which alone our soul can be truly satisfied,—a destiny which directs us beyond time and space, which directs us to God."

Answering to this threefoldness of constitution and office, there is a threefoldness in the relations of human life. Being body, soul, and spirit in the living unity of a person, man stands related to nature, to man, and to God.

The body, the most external part of our nature, is the outward condition of our life. The laws of its being are the laws of its well-being. A normal condition of the body stands in established hygienic principles—the maintenance of the right relation between appetite and supply, desire and its answering gratification. The sovereign of universal nature, man was to be the sovereign of his own nature, making room, in the complete subordination of sense to the guiding powers of reason, for the painless advancement of the body to a state of full glorification. He was to stand above, and not under the forces of mere nature; the master, and not the slave of sense; the monarch, and not the drivelling subject of passion—a rational, not a brutal being.

Man's rationality lifts him into the higher sphere of associated life. Mankind does not stand in the broad bosom of humanity, like a drove of cattle in an extended meadow, each feeding alone,

having no community of interests. So far from being the sum of separate and detached units without social coherence, mankind forms a natural unity, an organism. Man cannot exist independently of others. He has been formed for society. By his very constitution he is adapted to a social, and not an isolated state. He is joined to others by the nearest ties—consanguinity and a community of interests binding him, not voluntarily, nor yet arbitrarily, but generically, to a distinct family and nation. He is born in them. He meets them on the very threshold of life.

Society is coeval with man. It holds under external institutions, without which it never has and never can exist, conserving his moral, political, and spiritual interests. These social organizations are definitely known as the Family, the Nation, and the Church. They stand in the Divine Will. By the authority of God, they form the absolute order of life. Each, by its divine constitution, has its own law: the law of Love in the Family; the law of Justice in the Nation; the law of Holiness in the Church.

The Family is the starting-point of human life—the first form of our associated being. The primal order of life is obedience, prompted by love. Love is natural, obedience natural. Primally, love to parents is not tuitional, but intuitional; obedience not an acquirement, but a native grace, the autonomical, not the constrained action of the will, independent indeed, yet cheerfully and uniformly centred in the will of the rightful sovereignty of home. Authority and its correlatives, subordination and obedience, clasp each other in loving unity; effortless these last under the inspiration of Love.

The State, like the family, is an ordinance of God. It sprang not from human necessities, but lay originally in the divine constitution of humanity; its primal form theocratic—God Himself the recognized Sovereign, and His will the absolute rule of righteousness. Whatever its subsequent form, it is not to be regarded as a social compact simply, deriving its existence and authority from the will of the associated families. It stands in ground back of any such voluntary or arbitrary surrender of

separate rights for the general good. "The powers that be are ordained of God." Civil government is, therefore, an order of associated life resting in the Divine Will. It is the will of God that, in this broader sphere of human activity, the interests of the whole should be conserved by the subjection of all to the law of Justice. True freedom is not an unrestrained, but a conditioned thing, and is only possible in its highest form, where the most complete and cheerful submission to civil authority obtains. The law of obedience to the will of God here, is the law of genuine freedom.

> "He is the freeman whom the truth makes free,
> And all are slaves beside."

These social relations do not embrace the wholeness of man's being. His spirituality lifts him into the sphere of moral accountability. Accountability is the condition, not of actual, but potential holiness. The full glorification of the corporeity of man through his spirit, was the tremendous possibility of moral freedom. This capacity for spiritual advancement to positive and established holiness, required the presence of ethical conditions. As for the development of the natural life, man must stand in the order of nature, and for the development of the intellect in the presence of intellectual conditions; so potential holiness is only to be advanced to actual holiness in the presence of moral conditions.

With this vast moral susceptibility man stood freely under the Divine Will. The power in which his existence is rooted and grounded established the law of his life, in the limitations of which he was to move steadily toward the ultimate object of his creation. The divine prohibition touching the tree of life, was the first form under which the authority of God is expressed. Giving to this moral government its later designation, the Church, it fully appears, was no necessity of the fall. It was no mere expedient on the part of God. It existed anterior to the accident of sin; and, had the fall never occurred, would have continued, though not under the subsequent form of mediatorial offices and propitiatory agencies, but as a divine instrumentality answering man's normal development. It sprang necessarily

out of our moral constitution and our relation to God as the subjects of His moral government.

The law of the Church is the law of Holiness—the realization in the sphere of moral activity and freedom of the law of obedience to the Divine Will as the absolute law of human happiness and spiritual advancement; a life not self-centred, but centred always in God, as Christ the Divine-human Archetype, announcing the rule, has also set the example: "I do always those things that please Him." And as submission, uniform and complete, of the human to the Divine Will, was to be the form under which man's life was to hold, so the end would have been direct communion with God under the full glory of His Personal Presence. True to this law of his own moral being, he would have been advanced without bodily decay and decomposition to a state of full glorification, but only through the appearance ultimately of the *Λογος* incarnate.

Man's true being is thus a conditioned one. The normal order of his life has been determined for him by the Being in whom his whole existence stands. His will is not *ανομος*—a power without law. It must have truth for its contents. That truth is God—the absolute truth. "True harmony in man," says Dr. Ullmann, "is possible only when that which is God-like in him, that is, the mind acquiesces in the Divine order of life, and governs the whole being in conformity therewith."

In this, the absolute sense of human nature itself, we reach the Divine Idea of man. Taking into consideration all that has been said touching the primacy of man in nature, the exalted order of his own attributes, his representative character, and his glorious destiny, *Normal Humanity may be said to be the direction of all man's powers in the province of intelligence and free-will toward their Divine end: Man, in every aspect of his being, every department of self-activity, and every relation of life, acting, freely and voluntarily, in harmony with the divinely-imposed law of his own true life and eternal destiny.*

Moving thus in the sphere of reason and free-will, his destiny was fully committed to his own hands. It was given him to de-

termine by his own free act whether his will should be determined by the will of God, thus lifting himself up into the sphere of true moral freedom, or by that which is foreign to God, thus putting himself in voluntary bondage to the powers of evil.

Has man, by his own free act, realized this Divine Idea? Is human life, in its present outstandings, accordant with this original plan? The fact standing out most broadly, is the disharmony prevailing in the entirety of our being. In no sense is man what he was originally intended to be. Humanity is not in its normal, but an

ABNORMAL CONDITION.

The cause of this abnormity may not be apprehended, but the fact itself is too patent to be denied. The rectitude of human nature is the idle dream of errorists. The opposite, indeed, has been carried along in the consciousness of the race itself. There has ever lingered in the mind "the memory of a lost happiness." Not only is it embosomed as a sad, significant fact in Revelation, the very starting-point of its great truths; but it is met everywhere in the written or unwritten history of every people under the sun. The traditions of all nations are full of it. The voice of the soul, in these shadowy reminiscences of a better condition, speaks out this deepest conviction of humanity: Man is out of tune with himself, because his will is not attuned to the Divine Will. There is terrible discord, where there should be the sweetest harmony.

Power always proceeds from the higher to the lower. Subordinate officers stand in their superiors, in whom wider authority is necessarily invested. A derangement in the civil headship carries confusion and conflict into the lower official orders. The same is true in organic forces; and the illustration bears on the point we are anxious to make. The manifold organs and functions of the body stand in each other. The heart is the regulative organ. The normal action of the others depends on the normal action of this central power. Disturbed in the slightest degree by the touch of disease, and the disturbance is speedily communicated to the entire organization.

All man's powers are given to be harnessed for the service of God. Of these the will is central—the power back of all our powers—the innermost circle of our being—the great throne where laws are dictated to the whole man, where shape is given to human destiny. The turning away of the will from God, is the severance necessarily of man's whole life from its true centre. The refusal to hold here the relation of harmony with God, is the immediate consent to a false relation—a moral breach ever widening. "The bands of right authority are broken. The reins of the spirit dropped, and at once all becomes insurrection and rebellion, both in the soul and the body."

The separation of this central power of human activity from its divine rule, is sin. Sin in its deepest principle, is self-assertion. Its essence is self-will; its root, selfishness. All sin may be resolved into this, whatever its name or manifestation.

By sinning, man did not cease to be man. The capabilities of original human nature remained. None of its powers or properties have been displaced or discontinued. It has only thrown them into confusion and wrong action. The organs of the body, the powers of the mind, and the strength of will remain, but standing in an uncentred and wounded nature, their activity is in the interests of this inverted order—the higher ruled by the lower powers. The will has lost, not its strength, but mainly its right direction, in the forfeiture of its legitimate mastery, coming itself under the wasting bondage of sense. The reason still remains the faculty for the infinite; but sundered from its own proper contents, has fallen under the darkening operation of untruth and deception, and, missing the absolute Truth, is ever grasping at shadows and unrealities, losing itself more and more in the labyrinthian darkness of a self-made night. The organs of the body still remain; not, however, the servants, but the masters of reason and will, sinking themselves under the power of general intemperance, and tending inevitably to dissolution and death.

Because the body is the most external part of our nature, the consequences of this abnormal condition stand out here more clearly to view. It is witnessed to in the numberless diseases

which storm the very citadel of our being, or stealthily undermine and sweep away the pillars of our strength. Besides, what unsightly deformities does actual contact with the race discover! How is this crowning piece of creative energy broken, marred, and disfigured!

But these physical deformities are only the shadows of yet more hideous deformities in the higher region of the soul and spirit. The smallest degree of self-consciousness is the troubled sense of a mind poisoned and perverted in all its activities. How impure is the imagery of the secret chamber of fancy! What disgustful pictures haunt the imagination, from which even our sleeping moments are not exempt! How clouded is the judgment, and liable to pronounce an erroneous decision, holding, by reason of the operation of passion or partiality, the scales of justice in an uncertain hand! How memory retains a sense of injuries, and fires up the soul with the fierce flames of resentment! What crowds of pure and impure suggestions, like the beasts clean and unclean gathered in pairs—representing the power of self-propagation—in the Ark, huddled together in the soul! What wicked thoughts with winged swiftness pour into the mind, as from the very gate of perdition! What low jealousies are here fed with fuel supplied by the Furies, until, like some volcanic ebullition, their molten lava sweeps, unrestrained by law, conscience, or religion, every opposing thing before it! What envies, baser than all else, hide, like the armed Greeks in their wooden horse, ready at the auspicious moment to leap forth to the execution of their foul purpose!

But look farther. The capacity of thought carries with it the power of speech. Language stands related to thought as the body to the soul, its organ. There are no thoughts without words. Speech is the audibility of thought. It is man's prerogative alone, his distinctive peculiarity. It belongs not, in its faintest resemblance, to what are called man-like apes. Man's articulate speech stands far apart from the meaningless chatter of chimpanzees. But this distinctive mark of man's nobility is, at the same time, the mark of his degradation. "Like everything about him," says Dean Trench, "it bears at

once the stamp of his greatness and of his degradation, of his glory and of his shame." In man's language, it is not to be denied, is afforded the most mournful evidence of the height from which, and the depth to which he has fallen. How must the purest lip bite itself, the fairest cheek crimson with the blush of shame, and the boldest man hang his head in conscious guilt! Language is the direct transcript of our innermost life; and, judging from this ugly, but faithful transcript, how ugly must be that life itself!

Who now can look on this dark flood of human guilt, bearing on its seething, boiling tide the passions and prejudices, the envies and jealousies, the hates and hostilities, rankling in the soul of man, and, for a moment, imagine he is contemplating the primal order of humanity?

A like disorganization has passed upon all our *moral relations*. The present order of home-life differs widely from its true, normal idea. Human childhood is marked and marred by a rebellious spirit. The trial of an independent life is made by every child, without a solitary exception. The home is not, where the impetuous language of disobedience must not be checked; the child is not, whose self-will and temper must not be curbed. In this very beginning of human life there is already witnessed a woful deviation from the primal order. In the house of an Eli, even, dwell the desperate sons of Belial.

This restlessness, under home-restraints, becomes lawlessness in the sphere of the State. Hence the necessity of civil courts and police arrangements, prisons and gloomy penitentiaries for the punishment of evil-doers. Hence the secret conclave plotting treason, and the sanguinary work involved in the maintenance of the government! Hence official corruption, and the wide disposition to evade the true intent and operation of the laws!

The highest relation is that of man to God. In no particular is the abnormity of our nature so manifest as here, coming out in every form of irreverence, every degree of profanity, and every phase of unbelief.

Looking on these disorganized and perverted relations, no

one can, in his wildest dreams, assume the present rectitude of human nature, and imagine that this deplorable state answers to the Divine Idea of Man. It is clear enough, that, in the sphere of man's noblest attributes—intelligence and free-will—the original purpose of God has been overtaken with disaster. His whole constitution, with all his relations, was involved in helpless confusion and ruin.

Although forming now an inseparable, yet was sin not an essential element of human nature. It was not created in man; formed no part of normal humanity. It was afterwards ingrafted into man's constitution—a second nature, which so thoroughly penetrates and rules the race, that the realization in himself of Ideal Manhood, is an impossibility; and yet the race, in its deepest intuitions, and all along its sad history, has strongly clung to the hope of the ultimate appearance, in true humanity, of the Archetypal Man, in whom the sad catastrophe of the Fall should be amended, and the original idea more than realized—the work of God carried upward in the order of perfection and bliss.

CHRIST THE TRUE IDEAL OF MAN.

This absolute need of sinless Perfection in the region of a thoroughly human life, we have at length fully realized in the Christ of the holy Gospels, in whom the Godhead and manhood are united.

This unfathomable mystery, however, is not to be regarded as an accidental necessity. Though finding in sin a fresh call for the Incarnation, yet this determined not the *fact*, but only the *form* under which it should hold. It was no after-thought on the part of God; not something sprung in to meet an unexpected emergency; but that towards which the whole work grandly moved, and in which at length it reached its truest and deepest significance—manhood united with

> "That God, which ever lives and loves,
> One God, one law, one element,
> And one far-off divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves." *

* Tennyson.

As the Head of all things—the ἀναχεφαλαίωσις of St. Paul, the recapitulation of all things, both in heaven and earth—Christ was the Crown, as well as the Saviour of men.

Man, we have seen, was nature's complement and crown. Without meaning in any of its lower forms, it reached continually upward to the advent of man, who came in as its interpreting end. Man finds not the meaning and end of his existence in himself. His erect form already is the mute prophecy of something higher than mere rationality, as it is the preparation for the personal union of God with His own work. Creation is the movement of Deity in the direction of self-manifestation. The movement looked to humanity as its ultimate object, and yearned for a real union with man, for which there was in his constitution both a natural and moral aptitude. Man wants and yearns after God. This is Luther's conception, as appears from the following: "The Deity is a subject of a motion out of itself, which, without involving the loss of itself, desiderates humanity as its goal or object: humanity no less is the subject of a like yearning after God."* In full accord with this, Dr. Dorner says: "The only true conception of God is one, which, so far from being incompatible with, involves His being determined to an incarnation, by His own eternal moral nature; and any conception of humanity is false, which, either in a spirit of defiance or a spirit of pusillanimity, would regard the tabernacling of God in man as a thing either unnecessary, or too lofty."†

It would be an easy matter, also, to show that all history shaped itself, both consciously and unconsciously, after this inlying thought and burden of humanity itself. The hopes of mankind, in the felt need of redemption, have ever linked themselves on to some supposed supernatural personalities. Hence the deification of men, which obtained so extensively in the classic nations, and the humanization of God, under the most monstrous caricatures, in Hindooism, and the one conscious

---

* Quoted by Dorner, in "Doctrine of Person of Christ," div. ii., vol. 2 p. 75.

† Ibid., div. ii., vol. 1, p. 12.

struggle of Judaism—the Prophet which was to come—evidently the one luminous centre of its worship, its types, its covenants, its ceremonies, its prophecies—Haggai's "*Desire of all nations.*" With how much force, then, it may be said, that the Incarnation was the convergent point of nature and all history alike. Back of the accidental fact of sin, deep laid in nature and humanity, we find the necessity for the great Prototype taking a human body.

"In the fulness of time," this prophecy, for ages carried along in creation and revelation—the incorporation of the Divine nature into the inmost life of humanity—*was realized in the Person of Christ.* But coming to pass, it could only be in the highest mould and fashion of humanity. In its assumption it would seriously conflict with our ideas of the fitness of things, if the Perfect Being should take unto Himself an imperfect, ill-shaped and crippled form, besides running counter to the deepest intuitions of our nature, and dimming the glow of our religious hopes. The Highest and Perfect One taking the likeness of man, both as his Head and Saviour, would take that likeness, not in any marred and disfigured form, but in its normal and original perfection, as it came from the formative hand of God free entirely from all blemishes—even physically the Ideal Man.

Incidental mention only is made of the outward appearance of Christ, yet it is remarkable that this always comes before us under a pleasing character. To be generally attractive, a person must have a winning face; not wearing the scowl of the misanthrope; nor the sneer of the cynic; nor the austerity of an ascetic; but a countenance radiant with love, with blandest manners. All the Evangelists unite in testifying to the crowds which increasingly resorted to Him. There must have been a potent charm in His personal appearance to have effected this, not to be lost sight of in the attractive power of what He said and did.

Distant art labored to body forth this conception of the Perfect Man, as mirrored in the face of Him, who was prophetically "fairer than the children of men." The pencil of the greatest masters was moved by this faith and ambition. What love, and mildness, and majesty combined, must have beamed from a

face which the highest and divinest art confessedly expresses so inadequately! Incompatible with this idea of physical perfection would have been the decline and decrepitude of old age; and so, ere any blight falls on those powers, in the bloom and vigor of early manhood, Christ dies and rises again. A body first in the order of full glorification, will necessarily be of the most perfect mould.*

We look for this physical perfection of Christ to be itself crowned by corresponding *completeness of mental and moral character.*

Symmetry is completeness and harmony of parts. It commands our admiration wherever seen, in nature, in architecture, in sculpture, in painting, in man, his physical, mental, and moral character. One-sidedness loses its power to that extent in which the other parts, by such partial, and therefore abnormal development, are overshadowed and retired. A genius is one, in whom some one mental power comes out prominently, the others being thereby withdrawn and weakened. Such a one has not the power of continuous attraction—cannot hold the love and esteem of the people as a man less gifted in that one direction, but presenting a character on the whole more complete and rounded. Not the orator, fervid in his words, sublime and faultless in his rhetoric, graceful in his action, and brilliant in his delivery, but the statesman, who combines, with some charm of eloquence, a colossal mind, sound judgment and strength of character, holds the nation the longest. There were more eloquent men than Webster; but since that great light went out, the American Senate has never known a master intellect like his, or been moved by a voice so potent and majestic in its deliverances.

---

* In the bodily Ascension of Christ to heaven, the full glorification of humanity was effected. The work of redemption included the totality of our being. Hence the full purpose of the Incarnation was only reached in our Lord's triumphant return in *His glorified manhood* to His own native skies, according to the expressive interrogation put to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and, i. e., in order *to enter into His glory?* The Ascension makes provision thus for man's advancement to that state of bodily glorification, which had been interrupted by the coming in of the Fall.

There was, in Christ, the preponderance of no one intellectual faculty, to the evident withdrawal and dwarfing of others. As of His physical, so are we constrained to believe of His mental nature, that it was perfectly proportionate—beautiful and grand in its symmetry. Humanly speaking, Christ was no genius, and yet was He more than any merely human genius. He was, neither a Demosthenes, nor a Homer, nor an Aristotle, nor a Humboldt; not an orator, and yet, "Never man spake like this man"—for, although eighteen hundred years have elapsed since He taught, during which no revolutions have been more marked and radical than those which have gone forward in the world of thought, yet do His words maintain their original freshness, nay, their power over the mind is steadily increasing with every succeeding age; not a poet, and yet no poet, classic or modern, inspired or uninspired, Isaiah or Milton, ever showed himself such a thorough master of nature, and, with such admirable skill, wove it into His unstudied teachings, illustrating the sublimest truths in the simplest way, and giving to all He said a force and beauty above the charm of the finest poetry; not a philosopher, and yet no philosopher from Aristotle down, penetrated so far into the hidden nature of things, so thoroughly understood the essential principles of the universe, and was so completely master of the laws and operations of the human mind; not a scholar, in the sense of extensive acquirements in the direction of the sciences and literature, and yet to no other mind did essential truth stand out so much like an open book. He was unlettered and untaught.* He had been schooled in no system of philosophy; and yet He never, like the profoundest philosophers, moves darkly and uncertainly in the sphere of truth. He never comes before us a searcher after truth. "Truth is a part of His being." It is His native home. It dwelt in Him, as life in us. Hence He could say, "I am the Truth;" not the teacher of truth simply; but its living embodiment, and its perennial source—PERSONAL TRUTH.

---

* "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" John vii. 15.

That truth was an inseparable part of His being, may be shown in three particulars:

The sublimity of the truths taught, and the simplicity of His teachings. "Beauty unadorned, is adorned the most." The simplest things are the sublimest things. What a rare combination of sublimity and extreme simplicity is met in the "*Gloria in excelsis!*" How free from everything adventitious, and yet no act of praise bears any comparison to this in majesty. Christ uttered the profoundest truths; but in words so plain and simple, that they find the heartiest response in the breast of unlettered fishermen, whose echoes, through their consecrated powers and life, have gone out through all the world. Who has spoken more sublimely, and yet more simply and more effectively than Jesus spoke, is speaking still? How profound the truths lying in the Parables, and yet how full of nature and every day life, common incidents with which the people were perfectly familiar! Indeed, the perpetual charm of His teachings, their power to hold and affect the minds of men in all ages and every nation, lies in this peculiar excellence—the sublimity of the truth and the plainness of the language, the majesty of the thought and the homeliness of the illustration, so that as Pascal says, "One might almost think that He was Himself unconscious what truths He was propounding, unless He had expressed them with such clearness, certainty and conviction, that we see how well He knew what He was saying when He spoke of the greatest and sublimest matters in the plainest words."

His uniform and perfect truthfulness is another proof, that truth was an inseparable part of His being. What a wonderful unity and coherence mark His teachings! The first and the last utterances belong to each other as answering counterparts; for never do the last come in as amendatory, the conclusions of the more mature judgment, "sober second thoughts," as we say. Christ came to the truth not as we do, by the elimination of error. Truth, with us, is a discovery; with Him, a habitude. We enter slowly into truth, and that by the correction of former mistakes; the truth was in Him as the self-conscious presence and power of His being. Step by step, not as an easy stair-

way, but a steep and slippery acclivity, we rise in the intellectual and truthful apprehension of things; with Him it was the unerring intuition of Infinity. Sin has darkened our mind, warped our judgment, rendered obtuse our perceptions, imposing thus on us at every step of our investigation, with a fuller and clearer understanding of things, the necessity of modifying our views, perhaps radically changing them, or adopting opinions directly opposite. So liable are we to state things inaccurately, that generally a motion for *reconsideration* is a movement to secure the opportunity of undoing altogether, or more correctly doing what was wrongly done, and stating more cautiously and accurately what was blunderingly or erroneously put. Whatever we write we are constantly blurring with erasures, corrections, and explanatory or modifying clauses. Nothing of this kind appears in the teachings of Christ. He retracts nothing, modifies nothing, corrects nothing. Between His earlier and later words there is not the slightest conflict; not even that variation of sentiment which marks us in a three years' development of mind, or the clearer apprehension of the same system of thought. He is never self-contradictory. There is no paralleling columns of conflicting statements to His damage, so much in vogue now among a certain class of controversialists. You can never put the Christ of Judea over against the Christ of Galilee, the ministry of the first over against the ministry of the third year; and yet there were not wanting those who sought to inveigle Him into contradiction. He panders not to the traditional orthodoxy, narrow precepts, ingrained prejudices, and artificial pietism of the Pharisees, the dominant party, but ever firmly maintains the royal dignity of truth.

The spirit which marked His intercourse with men, is another proof that truth was an inseparable part of His being. There is, both in His words and manner, the absence of all personal vanity and self-conceit on the one hand, and all bitterness and vindictiveness on the other. Like clouds sweeping over the bright surface of the sun, is the greatness of our best men marred by overweening affectation and disgusting pedantry. To the damage of the truth, and a vast deal of personal discomfort, they

are ever making one feel the towering superiority of the person, who condescends to the office of teacher. It was far otherwise with this Teacher of teachers—the Prophet whose shoe's latchet the great Forerunner counted himself not worthy to unloose. Here was the wisdom of the serpent blended with the gentleness of the dove; sublimity, without effort, joined to simplicity, artless and unstudied; majesty, without the yawning chasm being seen, condescending to the timidity of the most diffident inquirer after truth, and the ignorance of the most humble and lowly.

Besides, there is not the *slightest degree of resentment.* How close, in the human breast, to just and proper indignation, lies the feeling of untamable rage and withering sarcasm! There is no self-control, so calm and imperturbable, as never, even under the shock of the strongest provocation and the rudest onset, to be moved from its moral equipoise and usual equanimity. The most even temper is, at times, ruffled; the most patient person, fretted; the most quiet, aroused and angered; the meekest, irritated and provoked; the most cautious, saying or doing something wrong when thrown off guard; the most enduring, hasty in words and action; the most forbearing, burning to resent some supposed or real affront. For this reason, how often is the noblest defence of the truth weakened by the freest use of the most scurrilous epithets, hurled, like Jupiter's red-hot thunderbolts, at some hapless antagonist! Nothing of this kind appears in Christ's dealings with His adversaries. Terrible denunciations He uttered, it is true, against the Scribes and Pharisees, but not against them as men. It was their studied hypocrisy—that which must ever excite the indignation of every right-minded person—He so unsparingly denounced. Vindictiveness never once appears; and yet, with the greatest truth, it may be said, never had man juster cause. How wonderful, under the most trying circumstances, is the effortless command of His feelings! In the judgment-hall, where the mockery of justice held high carnival, how did He fulfill, in His majestic calmness and dignified silence, the age-distant prophecy: The mute lamb before its shearers. And yet this uniform dignity

and self-possession, under the most direct and violent assaults, were not maintained at the compromise of truth, or the slightest connivance at sin. He neither withheld nor toned down the severest truth. With the noblest heroism He maintained it, but never with hasty and ill-tempered retort. "Individuals, not of common mould, and not dishonest, have quailed before the alternative, Truth or Life. The force of character is immense which, when hostility is gathering, and deepening, and maddening for its last brutal outburst, preserves a man undaunted, prepared to perish, but determined not to cower." * For no consideration, neither for the conciliation of His enemies, nor personal advantage, neither for ambitious ends, nor yet life itself, would Christ *sell the truth.* With fearful odds against Him, amid the wild outcry even of an infuriated mob, what firm and unfaltering adherence to the truth He manifests!

Passing from the mental to the moral element of His being we shall discover the most wonderful completeness and harmony, exhibited *in the most entire obedience to those, under whose authority He was, for the time, placed.*

Even from the fragmentary record given of this wondrous life, it is not hard to perceive that it was, in no sense, self-centred. This comes out fully in the moral relations He sustained, and they were precisely those we sustain. He stood with us in the Family, and therefore under the authority of parents; in the State, and therefore owing subjection to the civil powers; in the Church, and therefore, though the Son of God, One with God, Himself God, yet bound to render full obedience, in the very order of religious duty, obtaining there by Divine appointment. He is to fulfill all righteousness in yielding uniform obedience to the duties growing out of these several relations, putting Himself before us as the Ideal Man, and, by the merit of such complete obedience, lifting up with the power of full salvation all the ages and relations of our abnormal state.

Because of His true human birth, we find Him in the very conditions which surround childhood, always and everywhere.

---

* "The Christ of History." Dr. Young, p. 45.

It is little that the Evangelists say of this early period of His human life, but that little is profoundly significant. It puts Him before us in the home at Nazareth, as a loving and dutiful son, a Pattern to all youth of unselfish and unhesitating submission to the will of parents—the *Divine Idea* of the normal character of childhood *realized.* Acquiescing in that parental authority, from which our abnormal childhood is ever attempting to break away, He recognized the parent's right to rule, and the child's duty to obey. "Made under the law," the command was upon Him as upon all children, "Honor thy father and thy mother" and He honored the Divine command in honoring the natural relation in which He stood. Nor was there on His part, in the necessitous circumstances in which the holy family was placed, any premature anticipation of His Divine nature. No unseasonable miracle is wrought for the relief of pressing need. He put Himself under the power of the primeval curse, and the hard lot of men generally. As an obedient and helping son, far beyond His majority, He toiled with His own hands in the carpenter's shop at Nazareth. He bent His own back to the heavy burdens of life; and bent His own back to those burdens, that He might elevate, dignify, and sanctify labor, sweeten the bitterest toil, and in all ages be to them, to whom hard work is an every day necessity, a holy pattern of patience and contentment—the realization of normal Manhood in the sphere of physical service.

Christ stood, too, under the authority of civil government, rendering, according to His own sublime language, unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. His sighs over the humiliations of His country, bear testimony to His patriotic impulses. Some men, for ambitious ends, hesitate not to plunge a country into civil war. The great rebellion just conquered, shows to what sanguinary measures aspiring treason will resort to wrest the government from the hands of the constitutional authorities. There was nothing revolutionary in Christ. "A single gesture would have raised that whole nation against the Romans; but He uttered no breath against the government."* No rebellious

* In its annexation to Syria, a province of Rome, by which the last ves-

aspiration crossed His mind, though there were those who wanted to make Him king. In this full recognition of, and cheerful submission to civil rulers, we have the *Ideal Citizen realized.*

Christ stood likewise under the law of *moral development* by the pressure of moral discipline, itself only holding in the sphere of actual temptation. His was not absolute holiness; for that was not the property of normal humanity. But, in the presence of real and repeated temptations, and within the tremendous possibility of failure, His was demonstrated sinlessness—moral Perfection actualized, despite the Satanic craft and cunning which overwhelmed with sin and shame the first Adam. With the same weapons precisely, never retreating into His prerogatives as God, this second Adam met Satan, not in the mighty conflict to be vanquished, but in His moral invincibility under the severest tests, demonstrating what normal Manhood, in this respect, was divinely intended to be.

Christ stood also in the *Church*, under the law and ordinances of God. There is no abatement here of the Divine requirements, even in favor of the Son of God, when found in the limitations of the flesh; no lifting up of the Law's rigor. He must, for Himself, fulfill all righteousness, and only thus is there redemption for the race.

Not without the deepest significance, therefore, is this self-testimony, "I do *always* those things that please Him," i. e., the Father. This means, not merely that the outward flow of His life was in perfect consonance with what was pleasing to God, but that there was an entire unity and agreement of will. In this He realizes, in its aims, and activities, and holiest aspirations, the Divine Idea of Man. Here is *one life*, in-midst the same potent temptations of self-seeking in which all men stand, all that human life was originally meant to be. "I came into the

---

tige of its independence was swept away, Judea at this time was restive and feverish, needing only the fervent words of some leader to inflame the national pride, and provoke, in a general insurrection, the attempt to throw off that hated yoke. Had Christ been an ambitious demagogue, had dreams of political agitation possessed His soul, how readily could He have stirred up His countrymen to revolt. Had He so determined He could have rode into power on this wave of popularity.

world, not to do my own will, but the will of Him that sent Me," we hear Him say. And from this solemn and sober purpose, nothing served to move Him, neither the subtlety of Satan, nor the wickedness of man; neither temptation, nor persecution; neither the favor nor frowns of placemen; neither broad avenues of pleasure, nor the thorny pathway of pain; neither priestly malignity, nor perjured criminality; neither the love of life, nor the dread of death. In this complete surrender of His will to the will of the Father, and that, too, in the midst of real and repeated temptations to do otherwise, we see at length fully realized,

THE TRUE IDEAL MAN.

Under the very conditions to which every man is subject; in every aspect of our nature—physical, mental, and moral; in every period of life—childhood, youth, and manhood; in all the relations of the Family, the Nation, and the Church; in the full force of an independent personality—the exercise of reason and will, despite temptation, and Satanic subtlety and craft, Christ exhibits, in uniform and undeviating rectitude of character, what from the start lay really and truly in the normal sense of Humanity. This exhibit comes before us, not in single and prominent virtues merely, in which one may have schooled himself, but in the entirety of His being, and the wholeness of His life; showing both *that* and *how* moral goodness originally was intended to be preserved intact under the most trying circumstances. Human character, wherever it attains unusual grandeur, is nothing more than the brilliant patches of virtue pieced together, giving thus the appearance and impression of a manufactured work, not a garment woven from the top throughout. But here the opposites of "gentleness and power; lowliness and majesty; tenderness and strength; awful purity and unutterable compassion; vastness of thought and purpose, and condescension to the homeliest facts and scenes of life; sympathy, without softness; benignant forbearance, without indulgent weakness; sanctity, without a shade of moroseness or ascetic rigor; sublimity, without effort; majesty, without distance; decision, without extremeness; burning zeal, and entirest conse-

cration of heart, without a shade of morbid enthusiasm; humiliation, poverty, and shame, without degradation,—all blend together in an image of Divine-Human grandeur and beauty, such as thought had never conceived before, such as language must ever fail to express."* The archetypal conception in the Divine Mind, overthrown by the fraud and malice of Satan in the first Adam, we find in this second Adam, in the complete elimination of all the abnormal forces carried along in the bosom of humanity, not only restored and realized, but perfected and advanced. "That which from eternity was in the presence of God as an ideal in the mirror of His wisdom, we now behold in self-living eternal fulfilment and completion. The idea of humanity, in its process of realization, disturbed by sin, but renovated and guided to victory by redemption, is now perfected eternal reality."†

Touching this character, the portrayal of which we have thus imperfectly attempted, several things, as to its origin, may be put down as utterly false.

It was not the *product of human thought*—a pure ideal—a splendid brain-picture. This portraiture is drawn by four independent writers, and with singular accordance and agreement. It could not have been an independent creation. Could it have been a joint creation without any foundation in fact, or at best only the fragmentary legends of a truly sublime, but merely human life?

All ideals are the shadows of realities. Doubtless the human mind is susceptible of the ideal of moral perfection. But taking into consideration the fact of universal depravity, and the sinful circumstances of life, does the image of moral perfection live in the mind as a possibility? That it does not, witness the slowness of men to accept the actuality in the case of Christ. The presence of sin has ever been felt to be against its free and full development in any case.

This conception, therefore, of a perfectly faultless man, could

---

* Character of Christ, Rev. Dr. Burns, in Sun. Mag., 1865, p. 623.

† Delitzsch's Biblical Psychology, p. 568.

not, under the circumstances in which they, in common with all others, were placed, have suggested itself to the untutored Evangelists apart from its answering reality. They were in no moral or intellectual condition even to conceive as a possibility, much less portray as an actuality, anything approximating such moral grandeur and spotless purity. They stood themselves in the bosom of Judaistic thought and life. And any one, in the least acquainted with the predominant Pharisaical cast of that mind, knows full well that there was no room for the image of such moral sublimity in living union with such unaffected artlessness. Such perfect, yet unpretending and unobtrusive sanctity, it was not for them, considering the supercilious and turbaned religionism surrounding them, to imagine even, much less clothe with the answering facts of a thoroughly human life. The full-length picture of Christ could never have been given, had not that sublimely pure and beautiful life been a reality.*

English literature has few biographies superior to Boswell's Life of Johnson. "No intelligent person, who has read it, ever doubted for a moment, that the character there depicted is real, or that it is delineated to the life. We feel irresistibly that Boswell never could have conceived a Johnson, had he not known him; and that, even had the idea been revealed to him, he never could have made him live before us in every day words and deeds, and as in very flesh and blood, as he has done. We are perfectly sure, from first to last it is the same identical man that moves and speaks before us, and that the idea we get of him is about as true to the life as any human words can make it. We are, in fact, as sure of the reality of the robust and strong-sinewed moralist, from a simple reading of the book, as we are of the friend we met on the street but an hour ago." †

Of these four independent biographies of Christ, it must equally be said, the reality must have stood out before the writers. It is not *their* ideal, but the delineation of an actual

* Against the absurdity of asserting that the Gospel history was invented by the Evangelists, Dr. Lange with force speaks of the impossible existence of "Books of life, where there was not previously a Life of books."

† "Character of Christ," Rev. Dr. Burns, Guthrie's Sunday Mag., 1865, p. 623.

Personality, they give us. For four independent writers to work up such a creation, would be a literary wonder, exceeding everything the world has ever known. The Gospel is not an invention, not a romance, but a biography—the record of an actual life. Christ was no evangelical myth, but a real being; no day-dream, but an historical fact, a sublime verity; no creation of the imagination—*the creation of four separate imaginations!* It is really preposterous to think of four persons combining to form the ideal of the Gospel. Men do not thus invent in unison, and adhere so closely to a joint conception.

Given the character of Christ to have been an historical reality, it was not, in any sense, *the product simply of history.* It was not a copy of anything which had gone before; nor was it an improvement merely of any such antecedent copy. The most diligent search of historic records furnishes no model from which the Gospel portraiture of a real life could have been drawn as a copy. In vain is the gallery of history searched for the original picture. The fact is that the struggle of these anterior ages was, not the realization of a wholly sinless, but only the most virtuous and upright, character. A spotless character, unmarred and unblemished by any moral defects, stood not out even as a hope before the purest and loftiest men of pre-Christian times. Their endeavor simply was, by a lofty standard of morality and a rigorous system of culture, to correct the bad morals of the people, and elevate the race. They never dreamed of sinless perfection. Hence the philosophical rectitude of Socrates, the schooled moralism of Plato, the stoical rigor of Zeno, the stern virtues of Confucius, pale beside the lustre of this Sun of Righteousness, whose brightness is not dimmed by a single dark spot. Not an imitation, therefore, but an original character, is Christ. None are to be found who sat for this picture. He was fashioned after no pre-existent model.* He comes before us as an unique and unheralded personality. Of all ages, He

* The study of the apocalyptic books of Enoch and Esdras, also the Pirke Aboth; or "Treatise on Principles," and the Targums, cannot fail to impress one with the deep and broad chasm separating the Gospel reality from the ideal Christ of the Jews of His own and precedent times.

is the single Perfect Man. He stands by Himself, solitary and alone in history—the Prototype of humanity, but Himself unprototype, and without a parallel.

Although standing in the bosom of humanity, yet is Christ not *the product of humanity simply*—its loftiest and holiest reach from the play of mere human forces. From the discussion which has engaged us, we learn that although man stands in nature, yet is he not the creature of dumb nature-conditions—the result merely of the upward endeavor of life. The wonderful constitution of man—the reasonable soul and the immortal spirit inhabiting a dust-formed body—came not by the process of development—*creatio mediata*, but a direct, separate creational act—*creatio immediata*. Christ, in the demonstrated sinlessness of His character, was not human nature merely in its highest moral capabilities. The human was met in Him by that which immeasurably transcends the human. Though growing in human soil, the roots of His being are found exceptionally in God. He came not by ordinary generation, but by a new movement from the creative centre—a fresh overshadowing of the Holy Ghost—the Highest coming down into living, Personal union with the human, constituting not a Divine Man, but the *true God-man*.

In the constitution of His Person, and the whole order of His life, Christ stands apart from all men. He is a real phenomenon in the sphere of human life. He is only to be accounted for on the theory of the Gospel—the union of thorough Divinity and thorough humanity in the living unity of a Person—the seed of a new and undying life to fallen Humanity.

ART. IV.—NATIONAL LITERATURE.

BY REV. F. K. LEVAN, A.M., PRESIDENT OF WESTMORELAND COLLEGE, PA.

Literature, in general, claims our interest. It comes in a character, bearing credentials, and in the discharge of a mission, which, both separately and collectively, challenge the regard of all to whom it addresses itself. It is the offspring of the noble, illustrious, and immortal family of the united talent and genius of the ages past; cradled and schooled amid the birth-throes, growth, and maturity of those principles and powers in society, which have raised the civilized nations of the earth to the position they now occupy. The suffrages of the enlightened, in every clime and period, recommend it to favor. The social, civil, and religious benefit and advancement of ourselves, of the present age, and of the future career of the race, is the work in whose accomplishment it will be a main factor.

Like all great and good things, striking their roots deep away back in the dim and distant past, literature is impervious to time. It stands before us to-day in manly strength, freshness, beauty, notwithstanding the thousand battles it has victoriously fought. They have but strengthened its frame, given expression to its features, and by their very scars and marks shed around it additional lustre.

The history of *literature* is curious and instructive. It was first ushered into the world under circumstances by no means outwardly favorable to itself. Once here, much like many a poor orphan child, it lacked both the fostering care of protection, and a fixed habitation. Homeless and friendless was its start. Nor was society in a condition either to own its worth, or to appreciate its early efforts; for society itself had largely to be leavened and moulded by it, before either the one or the other could be rationally expected.

Literature strove long and hard to obtain an acknowledged right to live. Having won it, the maintenance of the right proved itself almost equally difficult. Strange to say, by many it was accounted an enemy to the peace and well-being of the community. It was attacked from every side. A ceaseless war raged against it. The men who cultivated it most were held in suspicion, nick-named sophists, dreamers, and the like. Itself was thought to lead to idleness, to render unfit for public service and usefulness; to have a tendency to ally its devotees to the Evil One. Yet it triumphed. The two proudest and most influential nations of antiquity threw their fostering protection around it, and were, as a reward, immortalized by it.

For awhile its sun shines brightly; but soon it is covered with clouds, which bring gloom and despair. When its favoring nations were borne down and submerged by the repeated risings of the huge tide of barbaric migration, it shared their fate, and was apparently buried with them in a common grave. It was saved from utter ruin by the Christian Church—that preserver of everything valuable and good it has encountered in the course of its history. Its friends, forced thereto by outward circumstances, hid it for centuries in monastic cells and consecrated vaults. Open daylight was forbidden to it. The sun of prosperity and the smiles of approbation warmed it only at intervals; and even then speedily withdrew the cheer of their presence. In turn it was attacked by both feudal noble and villein peasant. The one instinctively dreaded the light it would diffuse, if left free: the other unwittingly misjudged it, from knowing it only by false report, instead of having seen its kindly features, and felt its quickening impulses. Yet over all these obstacles it triumphed gloriously, and, beyond doubt, permanently.

Another enemy had also all along to be encountered. Indifference, on the part of communities and society at large, to the claims of literature, is well-nigh as hurtful as downright opposition. Of love, it is said that it must receive attention, and be cherished, to thrive; so literature must be respected and encouraged, to flourish. As sleep suspends the activities of our

minds, so indifference to its merits suspends the growth and effect of literature. It is not to be thought of among a tribe of boors and loons.

Singular enough, ostensible friends have likewise checked its onward course, and intercepted its benignant influences. Protection has often been offered to it by the powerful; but, in cases not a few, it was the protection of chains and imprisonment. Such support it had first to seek to escape; and when that was not possible, it had to wage relentless war against it. It must be unshackled and breathe the air of freedom, or die.

As having a practical bearing on our subject, we may notice, *en passant*, two other influences—well-meant, but mistaken—by which literature has been seriously harmed, and against which it has had, and still has, valiantly and uncompromisingly to contend. The one proceeds from those persons, numerous at all times, who, lacking alike calling and capacity, volunteer service in its behalf; and seek to mix up their tasteless and worthless productions with the genuine article. The other consists in the readiness with which we—and men generally—allow ourselves to be thus imposed upon. "Not all is gold that glitters," saith the proverb; nor is all that literature which claims to be. Pure gold will stand the proper chemical tests: true literature will stand the test of time; and what fails to do so, yet still claims the title, we are justified in pronouncing a spurious imposition.

Properly to understand the beauty, the variety, the extent, and the force of literature, we must study it;—and we must study it not only in the aggregate, not merely as a whole, but primarily in its different constituent parts. Like a rich and vast flower-garden is laid off in beds of various sizes, which again are planted with divers kinds of flowers, all adding to the value, beauty, and effect of the whole; so literature has its divisions, smaller and larger, varying in value, in brilliancy, in loveliness, but constituting together one grand unit.

For example, there is a very great difference between the Oriental, or Asiatic, and the Occidental, or European literatures. The former is brilliant, like the face of nature where it

has its origin; luxuriant, like the tropical soil; warm and cheering, like the rejuvenating atmosphere of its Eastern home; generally improbable and overdone, like the social, political, moral, and religious vagaries of the people that gave it birth. The latter has for its groundwork, the realness of life, the solidity, vigor, terseness, depth, and truthfulness, so characteristic of the Western nations; and, for its ornaments, the beauty and grace, that grow out of a natural and healthy development of such sterling qualities. Both are life-like pictures; each one of the people that produces it.

Cast a glance at another division; that of poetry and prose. Language, in its infancy, is poetic; and men and nations, in their infancy, speak a poetic language. Deep in the human soul poetry has her home. It was her words which first passed over human lips. She describes briefly, but with unsurpassed sublimity, the history of man's creation, and represents in glowing colors the new heavens and the new earth, the blissful place of his final abode. The passions, the imagination, and the heart, delight in her atmosphere, and develop themselves alone fully underneath her overshadowing protection. So firm a hold has poetry upon man's very being; so much in unison does she stand with his best feelings and noblest thoughts; so well suited is she to give the clearest expression to the emotions of his inner life, that we must ever look upon her as the graceful and gentle companion, with which he neither could nor would part.

Prose, on the other hand, mainly grows out of the rougher, the sterner realities of life. It is the form of speech by which we express the practical; man's contest with the natural world, subordinating its manifold riches, its dormant and active powers, to his own use and enjoyment. It is the language of men's intercourse one with another—now in the social circle, in the communication of news, of facts, in business transactions, in the demonstration of abstract truths—then in thundering appeals to the patriotism of a people, in arousing nations to a vindication of their rights and honor—or, again, in the gentlest tones of a message of love and mercy from the Father of us all.

Included in these and the several other divisions of literature in

general, yet clearly distinct from them all, is *national literature.* And here let us state once for all, that it is not our intention to give a full history of it, by pursuing its course, and representing its extent among every people that has given it an existence. We could not do this, if we would; and we would not do it, if we could. Our object is simply to define its character, and to show its influence; and hence we shall refer only to so much of the literature of different nations as will seem most apposite to the carrying out of this purpose.

National literature we would define, in a general way, as—*The literature that is produced by a particular nation, and that cannot be produced by any other;* or, in different words, *Literature which, both as to its matter and its form, bears the impress of a particular nation.*

Let us imprint upon our minds some of its principal characteristics, which may serve as indices to distinguish it, and as finger-boards to direct us throughout its ramified paths.

1. All literature must have substance of which it is composed; national literature has for its substance what the nation has produced. Its matter, that out of which it is constructed, is national. Primarily it reproduces the life of the people and their deeds; incidentally it gives outward form and substantial contents to their habits of thought, their feelings, their passions, their imagination.

2. It is dressed in homespun garments; it wears none of foreign make. The persons acting, the scenes of action, the manner of expression, the turn of arguments, the figures of illustration, all are unmistakably national. You know at once where to place them, where their origin must have been.

3. As literature, in the widest sense, has its rise in poetry, so national literature, lying at the foundation, of course, appears first in the same garb. The reason is this. Almost every nation, so far, began its career as barbarian. By a slow process civilization grew out of it, or was livingly assimilated to it. Only after the lapse of centuries has any peope come to civilized eminence. Now during this whole process upward, the undefined and well-nigh undefinable history of such nation, from this

very circumstance, abounds with poetic matter. The people, too, speak a half-poetic language, and conceive their thoughts in a highly-wrought, brilliant, and poetic form.

4. As any nation advances in civilization, contact with other nations must take place, and their influence be felt. Were, now, such foreign influence to become ruling, national literature, strictly speaking, would from that moment cease in fact, though it might continue in name. The home elements, the home powers, must exercise the mastery over the foreign, the strange. True, national literature may assimilate, to its own purposes and to its own glory, all that is good, valuable, and beautiful, outside its own proper bounds; not, however, by yielding to it, but by re-shapening it with its own strong hand. It so domesticates the foreign, that you can scarce discern it from that which is native.

5. Every nation produces, and works up into suitable shape, something—many, much—in literature that is general, universal, applicable to all peoples, and to all times; but it is so produced, and so worked up, as ever after to give clear evidence of its origin.

6. National literature is the mirror of every people, showing all the phases of its history and development, from the rudest beginning to any degree of advancement it may have attained.

These positions are no mere theories, they are realities; and the proof that they are such is at hand. We invite attention to a panoramic view of their exemplification—of their being concrete and actual—in the literature of nations.

For the same reason that we rather drink at the fountain-head, than where the issued waters have flowed for a distance, and have lost part of their first purity, we commence with Greece. Its literature, so rich, so beautiful, so glorious, is eminently national; in fact, owing to the almost absolute originality of its language, and its nearly entire freedom from foreign influences, it is purely national to a degree, reached by the literature of no people since.

We have somewhere seen the thought expressed, that the words of Homer are to letters and to human learning what the

early books of Scripture are to the entire Bible and the spiritual life of man—that in them lie the beginnings of the intellectual life of the world; and that rightly to understand and properly to appreciate this intellectual life, it must be studied in these its beginnings, where we may see in simple forms what afterward grew complex, and in clear light what afterward became obscure, and where we may obtain starting-points from which to measure progress and decay, advance and retrogression along all the lines upon which our nature moves. Homer was eminently the poet of the Grecian people. He permanently embodied, and gave natural—and hence both forcible and beautiful—expression to their mythic traditions, their religious, political and social consciousness. What they believed in regard to the supernatural world; what was handed down to them—enlarged, doubtless, by additions, and embellished with ornaments—from ages too remote fairly to come within their intellectual ken; he reproduced in abiding shape, and in the highest style of compositive art. Interwoven with these was the past history of the nation, not in the bold but bare outlines of truthfulness as to the real facts, but in the ever-living and brilliant features, in which these facts—gradually rendered half-legendary, yet sufficiently faithful to find enthusiastic response with the present—were preserved, known, and cherished by the people.

The same animus, with but a difference of object, pervades the dramatic literature. What thorough Grecians—be they heroes or victims, good or bad—are the characters represented in the undying creations of Sophocles and his compeers! How those truly national personalities, deeds and principles appeal to the mind and the heart of every Grecian, as a Grecian, irrespective of his condition! Pindar, in his immortal odes, shows himself likewise throughout true to this idea. They are Hellenic from first to last. Strip them of their nationality, and they will not be worth preserving.

Do we cast a glance at the oratory of this people. Let it be noticed first, that it was the national spirit which produced orators among them (were there ever political orators anywhere in

the absence of that spirit?); and then, that their oratory strode with giant steps to a position of eminent excellence, in fact, stands unequalled as it culminated in Demosthenes. Now, briefly, to analyze it. What gave occasion for it? The circumstances of the Greeks. Whence are its figures drawn? From Grecian life and scenery. What gives it the glowing warmth and telling force? The national genius, as it finds a living expression in the person and the language of the orator.

Take history. What the nation had produced in life and deed was written by its historians; and little more than what itself had produced, in some way, was written. The people made history, and then their representatives constructed it. When the one ceased to make, the other likewise ceased to construct. The national spirit, which alone could create, once gone, no literature, whether national or other, could be called forth. The vital power had taken leave.

Philosophy, though of necessity it often soars to the regions of pure thought, and elevates the mind to a position from which it can view things in their universal, elemental principles, has still anchoring points in the existing relations of society, which it may never let go. Its greatest representatives cannot divest themselves of their nationality. Kant had to be a German, Bacon an Englishman. And to have a Plato, it required the soil, the freedom and the institutions of Greece; in short, the man who thought and taught as Plato did, could then nowhere have been reared and have lived save in Greece. The same is true of the whole philosophical literature of that people; it is emphatically its own.

Such is an outline sketch of national literature as it existed (yea, still exists) in that nation which was the first to produce any extensive literature. No other people, past or present, could give so fair a specimen. As in architecture and sculpture, so in literature, Greece laid the ground types.

Though an apparent paradox it is notwithstanding true, that as Hellenic civilization produced the literature we have been sketching, so this literature produced Hellenic civilization.

Notice, in confirmation of the latter proposition, the immense reflex effect the literature in question had upon its authors.

The two charming epics of the blind bard of Chias, awoke the nation from intellectual slumber, and started it into intellectual activity. The legends and traditions of the past were turned into life-like realities; and the verses which told them were so simple and bewitching, that the very children repeated them. By the elevation to which the persons represented were raised in point of bravery, goodness and friendship, as well as by their intercourse with, and special aid from the gods, the energies of the people were stirred up to emulate what they had so much cause to admire.

History, in which we see daguerreotyped the profile of the past, likewise lent its powerful help to keep every successive generation conscious of the worthy acts, the persevering efforts, the unswerving fidelity, by means of which, their forefathers preserved, increased, and were enabled to hand down to them, the rich, social and political inheritance of their native land.

Epics and histories were then publicly and frequently read before the assembled thousands, upon whose attentive ears the master sentences fell, to penetrate to the mind and the heart, to enlighten the understanding, to warm up the patriotism and quicken the piety—as then apprehended—of every one within reach of the sound. An instructive instance in point, is related of one of the three great tragic poets of Greece. Attending, one day, a public reading of extracts from the history of Thucydides, he was so wrought upon by the scenes and deeds presented, as to feel powers awaken in him, which before he had not been aware of possessing, and the desire was enkindled in him to devote himself to the service of his people, by illustrating to them, in another form, their true spirit and genius. And he did do it. May there be many like him in America.

If history may be called a mirror in which we behold the daguerreotyped profile of the past, poetry in nearly all its forms, particularly, however, in the dramatic, may be regarded as a living kaleidoscope of the past, and, to some extent, a horoscope of the future. The Grecian drama, on the one hand,

brought out the inner life of the nation, the power behind the curtain that set the outside figures in motion; and, on the other, it foreshadowed and held up for inspection the dim outlines of the future, in divers ways. The people, who were made familiar with these productions, thus came to an understanding of the past, an appreciation of the present, and a preparation for the future.

Oratory looks to immediate effect. The orators of Greece moved the people as heaves the ocean. They inspired them with noble purposes. They enlightened their minds, strengthened their wills, incited their zeal, and called them forth to the achievement of deeds, honorable as any recorded, and in their effect lasting as time. They were the spokesmen of human liberty in the days of her early uprising. They were the interpreters of the inalienable rights of man and the sacred principles of freedom to the masses. The intellect and voice of Demosthenes could accomplish, what armies, treaties and laws, unaided by his intellect and voice, would have failed to bring about. No amount of polishing will convert a base stone into a diamond. No eloquent speech can be made to a crowd incapable of appreciating its ideas. From the mind, and the heart of the people back to them again, is the order. The orator seeks to give shape and tendency to the perhaps somewhat inchoate feelings and views of his audience. Doing this, he is effective; and if he select also the right material and cast it into beautiful form, he deserves his name.

We now skip over a period of a thousand years; not because we could find nothing to our purpose along the way, among the Romans for example; but because our purpose is answered best and most speedily by so doing. A remarkable illustration of our subject—in its pure form, too—we have in the early national literature of Germany. When civilization first began to dawn among the people of that country; when first, though still surrounded by their *Urwalder*, they came somewhat to a consciousness of their character as a people, of their central position between sister nations, and what they might do by a resolute use of their inherent powers and external facilities: then they

laid the foundation on which to construct a literature, as honorable and beneficial to the nation as it is an object of admiration to the world.

Like Greece, Germany, at the very outstart, produced an epic poem—*Das Nibelungen Lied*—in size, nearly equal to Milton's Paradise Lost. It were difficult to speak too highly of this production in its own sphere, as any one who ever read it will testify, and as a few facts will show.

1. It has no author, in the strict sense. An anomaly, sure enough. This item, however, is to be accounted one of its main merits. While it cannot claim to be the mental offspring of any single genius,—say as the Æneid is the offspring of the mind of Virgil,—it has the higher distinction—the solitary distinction among great poems—of being, both as to its contents and its form, the child of the nation—the offspring of the German people.

2. This becomes the more evident by noticing a second characteristic. Das Nibelungen Lied did not appear at any particular time. It is impossible to fix upon some positive year, or even decade of years, when it first appeared. Topsy—in the most read of our ephemeral novels—"'spected she wasn't born, but growed." This poem was both born and growed; and a century or two must be allowed for the process.

3. Not only are the places, the scenery, the figures, the individuals, German; and these last again, not more in the form of their Teutonic names, than in their entire personalities: but the whole poem is richly set with German traits of character, and strung throughout on the truly golden chord of faithfulness—True—the characteristic which, more than any other, marks the German people.

After the age of Epics had passed away—after the nation, as such, had ceased to give form to poetry, as well as substance for it—individual poets arose, who turned their eye inward to the mysteries of the heart, and gave expression to the passions of the soul in the stirring strains of the lyric muse. And soon castles, fields, camps, and, we may add, peasant hearths, resounded with the songs of the Minnesänger. Yet let these love-

songs be compared with the ballads of Spain—of many of which, by the way, we have translations in English—or with the songs of the Troubadours of France, and their nationality will be throughout apparent. They describe love as Germans understand, or rather feel it.

In modern days, nations exercise large influence upon each other. The spread of civilization and Christianity has measurably identified their interests, united them in closer bonds, and made them better acquainted. As a consequence, the literatures of nations have more in common than formerly, and can no longer be as intensely national. The literature of modern Germany is an instance in point. What properly comes under this name, what rises above mediocrity, what will live when the rest shall have perished, is still markedly national in its general features, though less so in its substance than was once the case. The emphatically great men, those whose works really compose the later literature, laid all parts of the world under contribution. Every nationality was reflected, "and yet no literature has an individual character more clearly marked than this apparent combination of all literatures."

It allows fair expression to the cosmopolitan genius of the people. These master-spirits communed with the master-spirits of other lands, but only to increase their inspiration, to give additional activity to their powers, to kindle their soul into higher and intenser fervor. "They gathered diamonds from every clime, but they polished them with a skill which was wholly their own. They made them reflect from every point of view, the image of themselves and theirs." "They studied the wise and the beautiful thoughts of all ages, but every word which they uttered was stamped with the impress of their own peculiar genius."

One instance more, and we shall consider our subject as sufficiently illustrated. That Britain should have produced a distinctive national literature, might be inferred, independent of a knowledge of the fact, from its island position, and the self-reliant spirit to which this position has given birth among the people. One drawback, however, it did have for centuries to

contend against. It was repeatedly conquered; and thus foreign people, foreign languages, and foreign habits were introduced, which had first to be put, so to speak, into solution with the native elements; whence a new compound resulted, to which we owe what is English literature.

Much of England's minor poetry is intensely national; the Englishman, English life, society, and scenery, are everywhere reflected in the boldest relief. With its prose literature—belles lettres, oratorical, political, and theological—the case stands pretty much the same. This one thing is notorious the world over—holding in literature not the less—that no one has ever had a better opinion of himself, or more carefully husbanded his own resources, that no one has dreamed dreams of greater future glory, and been more assiduous in bringing every available power to bear for rendering the dream of glory a reality, than sturdy John across the waters.

In Poetry the first star of magnitude, and a star of the first magnitude, is old Father Chaucer. His greatest work—admitted to be such by all, so far as we know—are the Canterbury Tales. However largely he was indebted to the Italian Boccacio for the framework of it, the poem itself, all its characters, their manner of acting in their respective situations, their conversations and humor, are throughout English unadulterated.

Spenser—

> "That gentle bard,
> Chosen by the muses for their page of state;
> Sweet Spenser, moving through his clouded heaven
> With the moon's beauty and the moon's soft pace—"

falls short of Chaucer in proportion as he is less truly national; more mastered by, than mastering, the foreign. Shakspeare is a cosmopolitan, and speaks from the universal heart of man. Yet even he bears about him, all over his works, the traces of the age in which he lived, and the people to which he belonged. More distinctively national is Milton, who, though in a general sense the poet of the religious, Christian consciousness, is especially that of this consciousness as it obtains in Great Britain.

But, we trust, our citations are sufficient. From what has

been adduced we may distinctly apprehend what is national literature, and from such an apprehension we may then also clearly see what is not national literature. And here it is in place to add, that very much of the eminent position, in every respect, which the two nations which we have lastly cited, hold, they owe to their literature. It has not only kept pace with their growth, but has also been a main cause of it. It is one of the brightest and most valuable gems in the wreath of glory they wear. We fall not down and worship it; we do not belong to that school, apparently numerous and growing in our day. Nevertheless, save religion, we believe that there exists no force in society equally adapted and potent to bring about the well-being and elevation of a people as its literature.

We have seen what national literature was in the past, and have taken notice of its effect. We have seen its more modern, somewhat different, but not the less glorious form; and have recognized its equally happy effect. It is yet left to say a word of American national literature—not so much that which is, as that which is to be.

Look at the background, we have as a basis on which to construct our national literature. We commence with the discovery of a before unknown world, to be added to a world known—a country that extends from pole to pole; intersected by rivers that exceed those of Asia; forests, in which you could bury the primeval German ones; plains, in which Italia's would be lost; and mountains, that overtop the Alps.—Then come the first settlements and primitive struggles; the character of the early colonists—the proud, stern, and greedy Spaniard; the adventurous, tenacious Englishman; the lithe, versatile Frenchman—Catholic in the Canadas, Huguenot-Reformed, in New York, Pennsylvania, and the Carolinas; the phlegmatic, discreet Netherlander; the thrifty, staid Teuton, and the lively Celt; the singularity of the original settler's life and experience; contests with the Indians—a race that itself is a singularity in man's history; the strange Colonial times; the Revolution; our spread and growth; our general history since.

Our whole nationality commences different from others. We

start not with barbarism; but we start in the full flush of modern civilization. No nation ever entered into existence under so favorable auspices and prospects; none is better prepared and more clearly called to represent a compact, well-defined, and yet expansive, free in its several parts, world-embracing nationality, than the American.

The blood of every nation of Europe runs in our veins, and yet out of the many is to grow one. There will thus be begotten a new order of national life, that may be as broad and universal as the soil it shall cover.

Again: new world-moving ideas have struck root among us. Their development and full practical application mainly lie with us. Many of the inalienable rights of man; civil and religious freedom, will erect their proudest monuments of victory in the land of their first adoption. All this, and much more, is matter for a national literature—a literature that will be, as it should be, somewhat unique in character, and unsurpassed in excellence.

We need a national literature. It will wonderfully aid in harmonizing our elements, and in producing that union and freedom in truth, as well as name among us, in which lie our strength, safety, and glory.

The American people will own it; they will call it theirs. They will foster and cherish it. No people ever clung more to its literature, and upheld it better than we will cling to ours, than we will uphold it, if it proves to be what we have a right to expect it to be; if it proves true to our history; true to the genius which characterizes us; true to the mission which Providence has assigned us.

Art. V.—ORPHAN HOMES.

BY REV. GEORGE B. RUSSELL, A.M., ALLEGHENY CITY, PA.

Orphanage is confessedly a most pitiable condition. It touches the deepest springs of sympathy in the philanthropist's heart. But in the Christian especially, it awakens feelings still more tender in behalf of its God-inflicted sorrows. Our divine Lord Himself, not only pities all their griefs, but has promised to provide the most certain, special relief.

All God's promises are sure; for He is faithful and true, In Christ Jesus, all His promises to us are yea and amen. Joshua, at the end of a long life of service, records the fact, that God's part of the covenant of deliverance made with Israel, was all literally fulfilled. "There failed not aught of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the house of Israel: all came to pass." (Josh. xxi. 4, 5.)

This faithful Promiser has pledged Himself in behalf of the orphan. He delights to call Himself, and to be known as the Father of the fatherless. And the special value of this relation to orphans, is so great, that in those cases where faith apprehends it, it even proves a blessing indeed, to lose the protection of an earthly parent by the all-wise and merciful providence of God, and thereby to have the sure pledge given of the divine care and favor of our Father in heaven.

Yet is orphanage, in mere nature, a calamity more deplorable than any other which in the same order can befall helpless childhood. Pitiable in the last degree, it appeals in a voice of most plaintive sorrow to our kindly sympathies; and the muffled sounds of the grave-clods, falling upon the coffin-lid of the buried parent, plead tenderly for the helpless orphan. God, our heavenly Father, also directly interposes with promises and pledges in the orphan's behalf.

How much as a class, destitute orphans claim the divine compassion and regard, the holy Scriptures tell us in manifold ways. The charges to His people to honor Him by redeeming God's pledges in behalf of the orphan, are numerous, and plain, and clear. To any one who has not given the matter direct attention and study, the fulness and frequency of Scripture reference to orphanage, will indeed be surprising. The most casual reader of the Bible cannot overlook the fact, so broadly spread out, that the most helpless classes of our race, the orphan and the widow, receive from the Father of all, abundant assurances of His interest and care in their behalf, and His numerous pledges and provisions in their favor.

"Leave thy fatherless children and I will preserve them alive," (Jer. xlix. 11), is the encouraging word of the Lord to parents called away from earth to heaven. So again it is declared, "A Father of the fatherless and a Judge of the widow is God, in His holy habitation." (Ps. lxviii. 3.) And again, "In Thee, the fatherless findeth mercy." (Hos. xiv. 3.) And again, "Thou art the helper of the fatherless." (Ps. x. 14.).

Besides these direct declarations and special pledges, there are also other Scripture references, which go further to show how large a place this mournful class of our race has in the gracious provisions of God's mercy. God *legislates* in their behalf: "Ye shall not afflict any widow or fatherless child." (Ex. xxii. 22.) "Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the fatherless." (Deut. xxiv. 17.) "The Lord doth execute the judgment of the fatherless." (Deut. x. 18.) His people were to lay up of their gathered fruits and increase, that "The fatherless and widow which are within thy gates, shall come and eat and be satisfied; that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all the work of thy hands." (Deut. xiv. 29.).

Among the grievous sins for which the people were punished, God charges them with having vexed the fatherless, (Ezek. xxii. 7), and oppressed them, (Mal. iii. 5.): Isaiah charges (i. 23) and (Jer. v. 28), that princes judge not the fatherless, who have no gifts or rewards to put into their hands. Wo is pronounced upon those who make laws that they may rob the fatherless.

(Isaiah x. 2.). To overwhelm the fatherless, Job charges (vi. 27), as the vilest of crimes: and the wicked (Job xxiv. 3), drive away the ass of the fatherless, and (9), they pluck the fatherless from the breast. In answer to the charge of Eliphaz, that Job had sent away widows empty and broken the arms of the fatherless, (xxii. 9): he appeals to God, because he had delivered the fatherless, (xxix. 12), and that he had divided his morsel with them, (xxxi. 17), and had not lifted up his hand against them, when he saw his help in the gate, (v. 21.).

One of the main conditions on which God promised to bless His people, was, that they oppress not the stranger, the fatherless and the widow, (Jer. vii. 6), and if they would do no violence to the fatherless, He would keep their kings upon the throne forever, (xxii. 3.). And because they did not hearken unto the Lord, but oppressed the fatherless, (Zech. vii. 10), He scattered them among all nations. (14.).

David prays, as the bitterest form of curse, that the children of his enemy may be left fatherless, (Ps. cix. 9), and no one to show them favor. (12.) And the Lord Himself has declared that He, who has shown so much favor to the orphan, will have no mercy on the fatherless who are hypocrites and evil-doers, (Isa. ix. 17); for the great mercy of God, is turned into wrath by the folly of wickedness.

Very tender is the pity of the Lord our God. And He shows it especially to the weak, the frail, the helpless, and the lost. The good Shepherd seeks that which was lost until He finds it; He gently leads those that be ailing and keeps the lame from being turned out of the way; while His tenderest care is bestowed upon the lambs, which He gathers with His arm, and gently bears them upon His own loving bosom. So the Lord our *Saviour dies to save our lost world;* while angels, in the worlds on high, where sin was never known, have not received such miraculous interpositions of the Divine favor.

From what is thus shown of the general character of our heavenly Father, it might be expected beforehand, that the mournful condition of orphanage would call forth His tender compassion and loving-kindness. The mercy of the Lord, that

extends unto children's children of them that know and fear His name; and that which is shown unto thousands of them that love Him and keep His commandments; is, therefore, not wanting to the fatherless child. The sorest temporal loss, and the bitterest earthly grief, which the Almighty visits upon the child called to bear the sorrows of the orphan's sad lot, cannot go unnoticed by Him, without whose will not even a sparrow falls to the ground. So well known among the prophets of Israel was this pledged favor of God towards the orphan, that Jeremiah uses this idea, not only to show in the strongest figure the mournful desolations of his people, but still more to plead in their favor the faithful promises: (Lam. v. 3), "We are orphans and fatherless, our mothers are widows."

Christianity falls not short of the Jewish economy in its care for the orphan: and Christ, who was the fulfilment of all that was promised in the Old Testament, embodied in Himself and in His Holy Religion, all the grace and truth of the Father of the fatherless. So the early Church, from the start, was fully impressed with the divine favor in behalf of the unfortunate condition of the orphan child. No promise of the Father was ignored or undervalued. The fatherless and widow held the same relation to the promises of the new covenant, that was so specially prominent in the old.

The best evidence of having pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father, St. James declares, is this: "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction." This apparently incidental reference to the working power of the Christian principle, is a stronger acknowledgment, if possible, in this particular relation to the orphan, than would have been even a special law given in point. The wondrous love of Jesus, in the days of His flesh, did not overlook the widow of Nain, whose only son, the dead orphan boy, He restored to her alive. And the Apostle makes special mention of the fatherless and nephews of widows, who are expected to learn to show piety at home. (1 Tim. v. 3.) The whole spirit of the Gospel, using the figure of adoption as setting forth our newly begotten relation to God, is the best evidence of the extended promise of the Lord to the helpless orphanage of sinners.

God's promise in behalf of the orphan, may to some, seem empty and vain. But He has made provision for its full realization. This is in the form of a trust mortgaged upon the Church. The perpetual presence of the poor, is an inheritance belonging to the followers of the Lord Jesus. The poor we have always. Of these, the orphan is especially committed to the sacred care of the Church; whose holy religion, pure and undefiled, proves itself divine and truly Christian in this; that it visits the fatherless and widows in their affliction. Never can the Church, the mother of us all, be unmindful of this sacred trust. As a true mother, bestowing the tenderest care upon the weakliest and most helpless of her household, the orphan is received as one of the least of Christ's own, in whom He himself is present to receive attention.

When the orphan comes, claiming help by the very fact of utter helplessness, so made by the hand of Providence, the call is in Christ's name; and it is also with divine authority. In all the temporal blessings, which have been bestowed upon men in any age in Christian lands, there is always held that reserve, by which the Lord of all, is to receive again from the hands of His stewards, what is thus needed to further His cause or make good His promised pledges. This trusteeship of the Lord's stewards can never be fully cancelled; and wo be to him who repudiates its conditions, and so dishonors God in making His promise seem to fail.

Sometimes it seems, indeed, as though God's covenant engagements failed. We often find men, in times of His tarrying or trying of our faith, to give up all hope in His word; and, considering the delay to be a failure, they begin most readily to find fault with God, when man alone is to be blamed. Who, for instance, has not doubted, or known others to have doubted, the promise given to the command to train up a child in the way he should go, that when he is old he will not depart from it? And yet whenever there is any apparent failure of the truth of this, in the nurture of a Christian child, rest assured, that the fault is not with God—nor is the failure to make the promise good, owing to any unfaithfulness, or even slackness,

on His part. But the ground of failure in the after life of the child, is most assuredly in the imperfections of the human part; the training, in some respect, was NOT in the way he should go. So, when God has intrusted certain benefits to man, that he may dispense them in the name of the Lord, and the treasure that is thus committed to earthen vessels fails to be securely kept to such end; or, when the talent that has been committed to the servant, who is wicked and slothful, is buried in the earth, instead of being made to increase for the Master; or, when the steward is unfaithful to his trust, and unjustly uses his Lord's goods, so that His drafts are not honored—then, indeed, the promises of God may for a time, by these human shortcomings, seem to fail. But God is true, though every man be a liar; and so bring His word to temporary dishonor.

If we, however, consider the Lord, who has promised to be the Father of the fatherless, and who will keep those orphans alive, that have been committed unto Him, as being absolutely Lord of all, there will appear abundant means and ability always at hand for making good His pledge. The cattle upon a thousand hills, and the silver and the gold belong to Him. Intrusted to the keeping of men, it is sometimes, when God calls for it, wickedly withheld. But He will always provide the means, nevertheless, to make His word of promise sure, and will transfer His goods from the unworthy steward to one who is more faithful.

Ravens can be made to bring His needy servant bread—whose *bread and water* were surely promised him. The widow's cruse of oil and the bag of meal can be kept from failing, until the famine be passed, at His word. So, too, the few barley loaves and small fishes, with His blessing, may more than suffice to feed the hungry multitude that look to Him for daily bread. And the ten thousand hidden ways of Providence may bring blessings, supply wants, feed, clothe, and comfort God's needy creatures, by the hands of men—or of dumb nature, if man fails to do God's will. True, God's stewards are not always men of faith, promptly honoring any call, which the Lord makes upon them for that which is His own, and is only left to their trust.

They may not have faith to understand, that when a beggar, a church agent, a widow, or an orphan, comes before them, it is as if the Lord Himself were saying to them:—"I am hungry; give me food: I am needy; afford me help: I claim part of thy care and home, bestow on me thy favors." To those who do so hear His call, He will at last say:—"Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto Me. Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you!"

History, coming down to us in the Christian Church, bears testimony to the fact that God has not left Himself without record, in any age; that He does afford means for the keeping of His promise in behalf of the orphan. Many thousands of Christian homes have welcomed the poor orphan in the name of the Lord. And in special times or places, when this class of persons, claiming the Christian charities of the Church, because, from whatever cause, too numerous to be fully provided for by individual effort, *institutions adapted to this end* were charitably founded and nourished by the Church. Lest the bleak world of sin should cause one of these little ones to offend, they are to be taken into a more safe retreat, which is of gracious right theirs, where the nurture of the Christian family may mould their lives into the order of grace. Homeless orphans are thus surrounded with the atmosphere of a Christian household; and "solitary" may there be "set in families," under the blessings and influences of home-life, which the Church of Christ provides in honor of their Father.

Great danger is there, however, that, in looking thus for the perpetual presence of the Lord Jesus, in the person of a little orphan, the natural eye, instead of the eye of faith, will be used. Had this been the manner of the prophet, little David would not have been taken from the sheepfold to become Israel's king.

Of Christ Himself, the prophet had foretold, that when they should see Him, there is nothing comely in Him, that they should desire Him; but as a root out of dry ground He would come to His people. Yet to an eye of loving faith, He is the fairest among ten thousand, and the one altogether lovely.

Now when He comes, making a draft upon His stewards in favor of a helpless little orphan, the natural impulse is to look upon the outward appearance of the child. If it is well-favored, and is measurably beautiful and lovely—affectionate and kind; or if its father has been a soldier, it is much more likely, on the side of mere nature, to call forth favor and attention. But if, as is most generally the case, the poor, helpless creature has a forbidding exterior; if it, by neglect and exposure, be untidy, filthy, ill-tempered, diseased, or deformed; nature revolts from all this, and, through such a veil, does not see the image of our Lord. Hungry, sick, naked, imprisoned, a stranger, and the like forms of divine need, in the miserable of our fellow-beings, are not inviting calls amid the pleasures of life.

Divine love shed abroad in the hearts of Christ's people, moves, however, to the ready discharge of the most unpleasant duty. Much of the duty that is to be done, in the exercise of Christian charity, is unwelcome. But when it has been done by the "love of Christ, which constraineth us," it afterwards "bringeth forth the peaceable fruits of righteousness." With this power, the Lord makes good His promise to helpless orphans left unto Him.

Considering that we are God's stewards, intrusted with whatever we have of His bounty received, it is plain that we are to hold ourselves ready to honor any call which the Lord may see fit to make upon us. And knowing now also His interest in behalf of orphans, and His pledges in their favor, we are in duty bound to meet the calls of God in this form, now so alarmingly multiplying on every hand around us.

War, with its desolating hand, has passed over all our fair land, and turned happy homes into sad wailing places for our slain fathers, and brothers, and sons. Widows, with their fatherless children, mourning the loss of their earthly stay and support, fill the whole land with sorrow; and pitiful cries are heard from the lonely orphans, whose helpless grief cannot wash away the bloody loss of a slain father, and whose desolate condition now adds but bitterness to the memory of what they have been called to suffer. Ten thousandfold evils of this kind have

come upon our once happy and united land; and we have now only to face them, and deal with them as facts; however unwelcome they may be, they challenge attention to-day. Never was there such a special call in this regard, perhaps, in the life of our nation, and would to God it may not again come to be a part of the afflictive experience of our country! Like the evils of the flood, may the good Lord not again repeat them!

Such a degree of special interest has this fact come to possess, that even some States, in the merely natural order, have been aroused to an unprecedented degree of activity in this direction, and are taking measures to provide homes for the orphans of soldiers. Our own noble commonwealth is foremost here. This, as a purely civil duty, is all well enough, and worthy of high praise. Even to provide for the body and the mind of orphans, is far better than to neglect them entirely—body, mind, and soul. But, both temporal and eternal, material and spiritual wants, ought to be provided for in the case of the orphan, as well as others. And just in proportion as the importance and value of the one exceed the other, do the claims of the soul and spirit become loud and imperative.

Here, then, has the Church a special call to duty. Our Zion, though comparatively small among the tribes of this country, has a population, embracing confirmed and baptized members and others under her immediate influence, of about half a million souls. Along with these direct and enlarging numbers, there belongs to our people no inconsiderable amount of temporal wealth. Millions of the Lord's substantial treasures, broad acres of productive land, yielding annually rich increase to the husbandman, and houses of comfort and plenty, bless our honest, frugal, and industrious people. The earth has not been made to withhold her fruits in their season, and the very clouds drop fatness. Surely, more than one lone talent has our Lord put into our hands, which He will take account of when He returns to claim His own. Happy will that servant be who proves faithful to his trust!

For some time past, the Church has been made especially to feel her duty in regard to this practical side of her Christian

life. Even before the war began to desolate the land and make widows and orphans by tens of thousands, there were initiatory steps taken to begin the work of caring for the destitute fatherless. The several Classes took action on the matter; the Eastern Synod had its attention called to the subject; and, finally, it came up for definite action during the sitting of the first General Synod at Pittsburgh.

A Committee had been appointed, at the Synod held in Carlisle, in October, 1863, to report a paper on the subject to the General Synod, to be held in the month of November following. On the report of this Committee to the General Synod, a very full discussion was held, extending through several sittings of the Synod. It was on all sides felt to be no longer an open question, as to whether or not we ought to have such institutions in the Reformed Church of this country, as would make the care of the orphan a part of the general benevolent work and duty of the Church. Whatever differences of opinion were found to exist on the general subject, related more to the kind of institutions called for, and the ability of the Church to cherish them, than to the question whether they were or were not needed. In the end the Synod, with great unanimity, adopted the report, with its resolutions, fully committing the Church to the great work.

So far as the action of the General Synod has come to take form according to the plan then adopted, it promises encouraging results. A General Board of Directors for Orphan Homes was elected, and has been organized under a most liberal perpetual charter, with power to authorize the organization of Homes for Orphans, to be under the special care and management of Local Boards, auxiliary to this General Board.

Already several such Homes are in operation, and others seem to be called for, and are to be established. The charity of the Church seems to flow readily in this direction; and, with becoming zeal, men are not wanting to dedicate themselves to the work. With God's blessing on these efforts, the largest good may be expected as the result of faith and good works.

What is now most needed in behalf of this noble effort of the Church, in order to carry on successfully the gracious work to which we are thus formally committed, is for all our people to take it to their hearts, and cherish it in the love of Christ.

No particular almsgiving carries with it a more direct reference to the charge of Christ than this, which undertakes to feed His lambs, who, by His hand, have been deprived of their natural support; and, so come to receive directly from Him, through the love of His people, their daily bread, at the hands of the Church.

For this charity there is, for us now, a call, which may not be unheard or misunderstood, without the most grievous failure of duty. The Lord Jesus is claiming for Himself—through the helpless orphans—shelter, and homes, and food, and raiment, and love. Thousands are by the calamitous visitations of war made orphans, in the most pitiable condition. They meet us in the streets, come to our doors, and plead for help. The voice of crying pierces the ears of the God of the fatherless; and He authorizes His stewards to take from the trust He has committed to their keeping, and bestow it upon these *poor*. He that giveth to the poor, lendeth to the Lord; and this shall be repaid unto him.

Along with other duties demanded of us, and with all other calls to charity, this one surely may not be overlooked. We may not glean our harvest fields so closely as to leave nothing wherewith the fatherless may be satisfied. The sheaf that is left is for them; the remaining olives should cheer their hearts; and the grapes left after the general gathering, should be for the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow. (Deut. xxiv. 17, 21). These provisions and allowances for them, are as much theirs, though they be in our hands; as if the Lord had by special providence given these directly to them, without having blessed us with the trust of their keeping.

Jesus when He would feed the hungry multitude with a few small loaves, first receives it from His disciples, then blesses the bread, then gives it back to His disciples, who in turn dispense it to the famished thousands. So He ever does; man becomes

His agent, His almoner to dispense His blessings. He gives to us; and shall we withhold from them for whom it was intended?

Happy is the man, who in this matter can use Job's solemn appeal in his own defence: If I have withheld the poor from their desires , or have caused the eyes of the widow to fail;

Or have eaten my morsel by myself alone, and the *fatherless* hath not eaten thereof;

For from my youth he was brought up with me, as with a father; * * *—

If I have seen any perish for want of clothing, or any poor without covering:

If his loins have not blessed me, and if he were not warmed with the fleeces of my sheep;

If I have lifted up my hand against the fatherless when I saw my help in the gate;

Then let mine arm fall from my shoulder blade, and mine arm be broken from the bone. (Job. xxxi. 16-22).

Christian charity is such a divine and heavenly grace, that it bestows a double blessing; both the receiver and the giver of its benefits are made to taste its joys. Not with mere words does it bless; saying, be ye fed, be ye clothed, be ye warmed; but in very deed as well as word, it ministers in the name of Christ. Remembering the words of our Lord Jesus, how He said, "It is *more* blessed to give than to receive;" it were surprising indeed, in any other beings than men, to find so many who covet not earnestly this blessedness, of the best of gifts among all the Christian graces.

It is a joyful reflection to know, that it is in the hearts of *many* to take part in this blessed cause of the Lord. The loud call to this special work of grace and love, in the name of Christ, comes up in its appeal to our Christian charity, from the sorrow-stricken of the land. It is a worthy work, for the church to take up the divine commission of Jesus Christ, to feed His hungry, clothe His naked, and provide homes for His fatherless ones.

There is no need that this matter should be urged and pressed upon any, by strong appeals to their sense of Christian duty. It is such a heavenly privilege of ministering so directly to our dear Lord and Saviour, that none should be found to refuse, in so far as they are able, thus to do kindness to Jesus, in the person of the helpless orphan. No wonder that the thousands, needed to establish and sustain the several homes already projected, are in due time forthcoming for the cause. The Home at Bridesburg has been sustained above all that was anticipated. The new Home recently purchased in the beautiful Lebanon Valley, (at a cost of $34.000;) the almost equally fine property secured for a Home in Western Pennsylvania by the St. Paul's Classis; the more humble Home in Centre County, and the projected Home at Frederick, Md.—all speak of the earnest work of the Reformed Church.

Let then a Reformed Orphan's Home become speedily a reality, in yet other parts of the Church. Let these Homes stand as noble monuments of our church-life, flowing from the loving heart of Jesus, and our Christian liberality and charity, as well as our living theology, will bless the present and future ages.

God will prosper the work begun in His name, and committed in faith, to the fostering care of His hands. Here is a broad and rich field in which the liberal hand may sow bountifully, where also there may be bountiful reaping. Here the people will be able to see the work of their hands prospering, in this thrice blessed means of Christian usefulness, and practical piety.

The blessing of them that are ready to perish, shall come upon those whose purposes join in this work, now formally in the hands of the Church. Let there be no delay, or slackness in beginning, or going forward. Even where seeming difficulties and adverse circumstances come in the way, God can overrule all for good to this cause, undertaken for His glory, in the name of Jesus Christ.

ART. VI.—THE OLD DISTINCTION BETWEEN "GEMEINDE" AND "KIRCHE,"

WITH REFERENCE TO THE 74TH QUESTION OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

The status of the unbaptized children of Christian parents is at present a subject of considerable thought in the Reformed Church. Some are disposed to hold that, according to the Heidelberg Catechism, they are members of the Church by virtue of their birth of Christian parents. This view runs out into dangerous consequences, and is plainly untenable. It has, moreover, no ground either in the Catechism or in the theology of the Church in the period which gave birth to our symbol, or that has since been current. This false and dangerous theory is based upon a simple misapprehension, which it is the object of this article to illuminate and correct.

What has confused the minds of those who have adopted this false theory, is a mistranslation* of the 74th answer in the Heidelberg Catechism. In answer to the question, "Are infants also to be baptized?" the answer is in the affirmative; and the ground on which it is based in the old English version is, that "they, as well as the adult, are included in the covenant and Church of God." This is taken to teach that they are to be baptized because they are already members of the Church; and this, also, is plainly the sense of the language as it stands in the translation. But now take this meaning as the true one,

* It is well known that the English translation which we have in the old hitherto received version is altogether irresponsible, and without any ecclesiastical authority. It is not even known who made the translation. It came to us, as it seems, from the version in use in the Dutch Church, but merely through the book-publisher. It is said that the translation was made in England by a woman. The version contained in the Triglot Edition, is the first critical English translation made under the eye of the Church. Even this, as yet, has not been ecclesiastically sanctioned.

and you have a flat contradiction of it immediately following, where it says: "They must, therefore, by baptism, as a sign of the covenant, be also admitted into the Christian Church." How can they be admitted into the Christian Church, when they are already included in the covenant and Church of God?

Such a palpable contradiction bears on its face the suggestion that there must be something wrong in the translation, and we need only look at the original to assure ourselves that this is actually the case. There we find that the first part of the passage, which is thus made in the translation to contradict itself, reads: "Dieweil sie sowohl als die Alten in den Bund Gottes und seine *Gemeine* gehören—and the second reads: "so sollen sie auch durch die Taufe, als des Bundes-Zeichen, der Christlichen *Kirche* einverleibt," &c. The mistake is that the old English translation makes no distinction between the words *Gemeinde* and *Kirche*, which two words in the mind of the authors of the Catechism, and the theology of the Church then and since, as well as in the German *usus loquendi*, have quite a different sense.

Gemeinde is a wider and more general conception than *Kirche;* it includes more. It has the sense of the English community, commonalty, communion, congregation. Many by birth, traditionary life, and general communion belong to the Christian community, who are not incorporated members of the Church. Thus, in Judaism, all children born of Jewish families belonged to the religious community of the people of God, but they were not members of the Jewish religious constitution or Church until they were circumcised. This alone made them members of the divinely instituted Jewish economy, and conferred upon them, and assured to them its rights and mercies. Their birth of Jewish parents gave them great privileges as standing and living in the chosen community; but not their birth, only their circumcision made them actually incorporated members of the divine Jewish constitution of grace. In like manner children of Christian parents stand in the Christian community, and as such occupy a position of decided privilege and advantage; they have promises, by which they are included with their parents in the pro-

mised mercies of the same covenant, and have their incorporation into the Church insured to them by the position and piety of their parents, but they become members of the Church only by their actual baptism.

We have a similar distinction and difference, even in other spheres. There are many in a nation; as, for instance, all children and minors, besides others who from abroad live in its bosom, who are not actual citizens, and thus members incorporate in the nation. They are part and parcel of the national commonalty or community, but not members of the organic constitution of the nation. So in every Christian country, and in every Christian congregation there are many who belong to the Christian community, who are not actual members of the Church. It is in this sense that even Congregationalists make a distinction between the congregation and the Church; in the congregation they include all who by traditionary life, or by preference, sympathy, and community of thinking and feeling, are in the draught of the Church's influence; but in the Church they include only such as have become actual members of the body by the rites, and according to the order, current among them.

In the Palatinate, where no denominational divisions existed, but all were Reformed, the community was one, and it included all, adults and infants; but the Church was a divine constitution in the bosom of this Christian community; into this Church baptism alone could admit, and infants who belonged to this Christian community, and belonged at the same time to the families of their parents, who stood in the Church, and were, moreover, with these parents included in the promise of the covenant which baptism completed and sealed, the title of these infants to baptism, and so to incorporation with the Church, was regarded as sure and indisputable.

Some strenuous Calvinists were disposed to find the basis of Gemeine farther back in the divine election, thus holding that all included in the eternal election, were by virtue of it included in the *Gemeine*, though not yet actually in the Church, but entitled on this ground to admission by baptism. This, however, seems confined to some of the Dutch commentators, who were

particularly disposed to interpret the Catechism by the strictest logical consequences of the decretal system. Thus D'Outrein, in his catechetical exposition of the 74th Question, asks: *Ques.* "Show further that the children of Christians also belong to the people of God (Gemeine)? *Ans.* Christ has purchased His people (Gemeine) with His blood (Acts xx. 28). The elect children are also purchased by the blood of Christ. Therefore the elect children also belong to the people of God (Gemeine)." We have not found this theory in other commentators on the Catechism, and it was clearly not in the mind of its authors, as it is also foreign to its entire churchly genius.

Not on the ground of abstract eternal election, but by birth from and hereditary relation to their Christian parents, does the Catechism regard the children of Christian parents as belonging to the *Gemeinde*. Hence, also, its commentators are in the constant habit of referring to the analogous fact, that in the Old Testament, even the children of Jewish parents, notwithstanding their Jewish birth brought them many advantages, had to be circumcised as the *conditio sine qua non* of membership in the divine constitution of grace as it then stood.

This is precisely what the Heidelberg Catechism teaches on this question, the sense of which is wholly perverted by the unfortunate translation in the old version, and has been the means of badly misleading some, and the source of much embarrassment to others. It will accordingly be found that in the translation contained in the Triglot Edition of the Catechism, this awkward blunder has been corrected. There the proper distinction between *Gemeinde* and *Kirche* is observed, and the true sense of the original correctly given thus: "Since they, as well as their parents,* belong to the covenant and *people of God*." Then follows without the contradiction, the other part: "They are also by Baptism, as a sign of the covenant, ingrafted into the Christian Church."

It will be interesting to show that by the older translators of

* Die Alten," being a common expression for the "parents." To translate it literally "the old ones," or, as in the common version, "Adults," misses the sense entirely.

the Catechism, and in the translated commentaries on it, this distinction between the words *Gemeinde* and *Kirche* is carefully observed, while in some late ones it is entirely overlooked and unperceived.

We must, however, here state the fact, that the word *Gemeine* was also sometimes used so as to include the sense of the word Church. But in such cases this sense is determined by the context, and it is always so used as carefully to fix its sense in this way. The error referred to has grown out of the habit of making it in *all cases* equal to the word Church. Wherever the word is uniformly taken to be equal to the word Church, flat contradictions arise; and where the distinction is made, another word or phrase is used to give its equivalent in the translation.

Let us give some illustrations from Dr. Parry's old English translation of Pareus' Ursinus, and the translation by Dr. Williard, recently made.* We have not the Latin of Pareus, so as to verify the distinction between the two words in question in the Latin. Nor is this absolutely necessary, since it is clear from the English translation made from the Latin that the same distinction is made in the Latin itself.

Notice first how the distinction referred to is recognized in the following quotation from Parry's English translation of Pareus' Ursinus. He says, all to whom the covenant doth belong have a right to baptism: "whether they be of understanding, professing faith, and amendment of life, or infants born *in the wombe of the Church.*"

---

* In what we are necessarily compelled to say of this translation, we, of course, do not wish in the least to undervalue the labor of Dr. Williard in giving this large work an English dress, which is valuable as a book of reference. Nor do we attribute to him any wrong motive, much less suppose for a moment that he made his translation in the interest of a theory. He was evidently carried along unconsciously by the influence of thinking then and still current in our popular and prevailing American theology, a snare into which it has been, and still is, so easy to fall. We are confident that his love for the true sense of the Catechism will insure his favor of the criticism we make, especially when the mistake is one suggested to and inwrought in his youthful study by a bad translation of the Heidelberg Catechism itself.

Again: "All they are to be baptized, who are to be accounted for the disciples and schollers of Christ: But for the disciples and schollers of Christ are to be accounted all those of understanding, who professe faith and repentance; neither they only, but their infants also, which are born in the Church, *that is, in the schoole* of Christ." (P. 417).

How clear is the distinction maintained in the following extract: "Baptisme is instituted *to be a token and symbole of our receiving and entrance into the Church.* For these are opposed and contradictory, *To be*, and *Not to bee* in the Church: *To enter*, and *Not to enter* into the Church. For God will have all THE CITIZENS OF HIS CHURCH thus enfranchised; and those who are not baptized when they may, *hee will not have reckoned in the number of his Church.*" (P. 412).

In a word, in Dr. Parry's old translation, Pareus' Ursinus, is over and over made to declare that Baptism is the rite of initiation into the Church, and that the baptized "onely are received into the Church" (p. 412), that it is "a receiving or matriculating and admitting" into the Church (p. 424), and yet he also tells us just as clearly, that "infants are born in the womb of the Church," and that they are "from their mother's wombs to be reckoned for members of the Church." (pp. 417, 418.) Who does not clearly see that here we must either charge the author with a plain and flat contradiction, or else make the distinction referred to, which, even in these passages where the English translator uses the word Church, is observed and recognized in the peculiar expressions "born in the *womb of the* Church," and "*reckoned* for members"—that is regarded as members only in a certain peculiar sense.

Dr. Williard in his translation of Pareus' Ursinus, seems not to have noticed, at least has not at all observed and recognized this distinction. One must wonder that the palpable contradictions, in which the translation involves the text, did not startle the translator, and suggest to him to seek for the proper solution. A few quotations will make this oversight and consequent contradiction clear.

Thus the third of the above quoted passages from Pareus

(the middle of it, however, omitted by Dr. Williard, according to the copy before us) is rendered as follows:

"Baptism was appointed to be the sign of our entrance and reception into the Church; because God will have all those who are members of His Church (all the citizens of His Church, Parry translates) to be admitted in this way, so that those who are not baptized, when they enjoy sufficient opportunity, are excluded from the Church." (p. 360.) What are we here taught according to the translation, which does not recognize the distinction in question? We are taught that God will have all those who *are* members of the Church, *admitted* into the Church by baptism! The same kind of palpable contradiction, which we have from the same oversight in the old version of the Catechism, where we are taught that infants *are* included in the covenant and Church of God, and must, therefore, by baptism be also *admitted* into the Christian Church!

How Parry observes this distinction, and Dr. Williard overlooks it, may be seen most clearly from another passage: Dr. Williard translates: "These (infants) are also disciples of Christ, being born in the *Church*." (p. 362.) Parry translates: ("Infants born of Christian parents) also are disciples, as being born in the *schoole* of Christ." (p. 414).

But we notice a few more instances of the flat contradictions referred to. On page 369 of Williard's Ursinus, we are told by the translation that "infants are born in the Church," and yet on page 367, we are told that baptism is "A sacrament, which God has instituted to be a solemn rite of initiation into the Church," (also on p. 370), and on page 360, substantially the same thing is taught in several places. On page 369, we are told that "Christ wills that all who belong to Him and His Church should be separated from the world by baptism." Those who are in the Church by birth, are by baptism to be initiated into it! On page 373, we are told that "the infant children of Christians are also *included* in the Church," then we are told in the same sentence that Christ will have them "received and enrolled by baptism," then, still in the same sentence, we are told that by baptism, as by circumcision in the Old Testament,

their "reception into the Church is sealed;" and at the close of the sentence, we have the conclusion "that those infants should be baptized, who are either born in the Church, or come into it from the world with their parents!"

What does all this mean? We must either charge Pareus' Ursinus with uttering palpable nonsense, believe that he flatly contradicts himself over and over, or seek for a solution which has escaped the eye of the translator. The solution is clearly to be sought in the distinction brought out in this article. Admit this distinction, which we have proved to have been made by the authors of the catechism, and by the theological writers of that age, and ever since, and the sense is at once clear and in harmony with itself.

The children of Christian parents, then, were regarded as belonging to the Christian *community* into the bosom of which their birth in Christian families necessarily introduced them. This, however, did not, in the view of the Reformed Synods and theologians, constitute them members of the Church. It entitled them to baptism, and by its means, to membership in the Church, and it insured this privilege to them by God's promise, and by all the force of the Christian faith and churchly position of their parents. But by baptism alone could they be actually incorporated into the Christian Church. This gave them a position, and put them in possession of a "great grace" which their birth of Christian parents never could do.

If their birth of Christian parents makes them members of the Church, which membership their baptism is only to ratify and confirm, as some would have it that the Reformed Synods and theologians teach, what would be the sense of the declaration in this same 74th question, that these same infants must, by being ingrafted into the Christian Church, be also "distinguished from the children of unbelievers?" How can they be more clearly distinguished from the children of unbelievers than by being members of the Church, while the children of unbelievers are not. But this, according to the theory we are exposing, is already theirs *as children of Christian parents.* No; according to the Catechism, it is not their birth of Christian

parents that distinguishes them, but *after* their birth from Christian parents they must still be distinguished from them; and this is to be done by ingrafting them by baptism "into the Christian Church."

The false theory of the interpretation of the Catechism referred to, is also prone to fall into the error of separating from each other the *promise* of God, the *covenant* of God, and *baptism*. Because God's promise is given to the children of Christian parents, or rather because the children are included in that promise, they at once conclude that all that is outward in the covenant and baptism is also so included at once in substance, and without the addition of the sacramental baptismal act. The symbolical and so the olden scientific theology of the Reformed Church, also sometimes *seems* to overlook the fact that these three are in their completion one, but it is only *apparently* that they so do. For when they predicate the Church membership of infants, upon the promise of God, they always affirm or imply that that promise has been completed and fulfilled by the actual covenant of baptism. So when they speak of the covenant of God as constituting children members of the Church and heirs of salvation, they always mean that the covenant itself is only completed by baptism. With them, the promise is not the covenant but only the promise of the covenant, and the covenant is not an abstract thing, whether in the form of a promise or a word of God, but a concrete reality, or decisive initiation and transaction. The initiation of baptism is the initiation of the covenant, and the act of baptism is itself the act in and by which God makes and completes His covenant with those with whom He promised to make it. The same mischief and confession which results when men separate the *gospel* from the *sacraments*, as if the gospel were one thing and the sacraments another, instead of seeing that the very sense and substance of the gospel is to lead men to submit themselves to the sacraments, results also from the error of sundering or confounding promise, covenant, and sacrament. We need only open any of the old theological works to learn that the sacrament of holy baptism is the seal and confirmation of the promise and covenant, and thus

their confirmation and completion—that without which they are both incomplete and unfulfilled. When they apply to baptism the expression "*sign* of the covenant," what does it mean, but that the covenant is *only where its sign is*. The sign is the sign that the covenant is *there*, and nowhere else. If baptism is the sign of the covenant, then the covenant is in baptism; for there alone does the sign indicate it to be. The covenant does not therefore exist for us as an abstraction, or as something afar off in the mind of God; we look for it in the transaction to which God directs us by the sign. Baptism *is* the covenant; that is, it is that tangible, decisive transaction which makes God's promise a covenant to us.

Why is it necessary to construct a theory by which the infants of believing parents are to be brought into the Church by birth, and without baptism? And why for this purpose are promise and baptismal covenant sundered, so as to make the promise in and of itself, actualize what it only promises? It is plainly to lower the force, and set aside the "great grace" of holy baptism. This work we must leave in the hands of such as have the taste to consecrate this holy sacrament of those divine contents which belong to the Churchly system of grace, in the interest of the unchurchly and unsacramental spirit and tendencies of the age. We only protest against any attempt to saddle the miserable theory upon the Heidelberg Catechism, and through it, upon the Reformed theology.

We know full well that it is possible to take Caloni, Ursinus, Olevianus, or almost any of the Reformed theologians, and by the use of the *one side* of their statements in regard to the Church and the sacraments, make them teach high-Churchly and sacramental views, and by taking the *other side* of their statements make them teach *low*-Church, and even *no*-Church theories. This we have seen done to more than our satisfaction. But who that believes that these great men were entitled to the position which the testimony of the Church has awarded them, can believe this to be fair dealing with them? If they thus contradict themselves, it is plain they never meant to do it. All we need is the key by which their writings are fairly in-

terpreted. They can easily be made to contradict themselves in the same way as we have seen the Heidelberg Catechism can be made to contradict itself, and as the Pareus' Ursinus commentary can be made to contradict itself. But the same, or, in regard to other points, a similar error of interpretation as the one we have shown applies to the Catechism, will carry the same light into the works of these Reformed theologians, and show that what appears to be contradiction and confusion, is orderly and harmonious in its own proper light. Let him who enters for a survey into this theological world, look to the color of his glasses. What he appears to see in them, may be in fact, only peculiarities in his own spectacles.

ART. VII.—CHRIST THE LIFE OF THE WORLD.

BY REV. I. E. GRAEFF, LANCASTER, PA.

There was a time when the personality of Jesus Christ, and the works which He did, were the only clue to the character of His mission. This was all the evidence that was needed, and that could be had at the time. The apostles knew and were sure, when they beheld the overshadowing superiority of His person and witnessed the transcending glory of His works, that He was the Christ, the Son of the living God. And after He had suffered and died, and was risen again, and had ascended into glory, there could no longer be any doubt in the minds of His disciples as to the triumphant success of His kingdom in the earth. In the joyous glow and vigor of this consciousness of absolute success, and in the full power of the pentecostal unction, the gospel of truth and of grace began to bear testimony of what had been seen and handled of the Word of God, and the world yielded to the force of the testimony. The apostles and early disciples had the advantage in this, that they stood in direct personal connection with the Word made flesh and were endowed with extraordinary powers; but we have

eighteen hundred years of Christian experience and history as an unimpeachable witness, that God is in Christ Jesus, reconciling the world unto Himself. The personality of the God-man is as potent as ever, the pentecostal unction has lost none of its inspiring force, and the voice of history is added to bear aloft the banner of the gospel as the power of God unto salvation.

Now, the gospel is emphatically a world-saving power. It enters into the life of the world in an organic way and delivers it from the degrading bondage of ignorance and sin. Much of the professedly evangelical thinking of the times, we are aware, rests upon a different view altogether. It looks at the matter rather as being of an outward mechanical order, reaching only here and there an individual in a saving way, while the world, as a whole, remains unchanged and unsaved. According to this scheme, there can be no correspondence between the order of nature and that of grace, except in the way of outward judicial contact, and therefore there can be no real marriage of divine and human powers, of the life of Christ with the life of the race, in an abiding, historical, sacramental union, and continuing in the world in such a way as to carry forward society in a living process of life and growth in knowledge, and in faith, and in hope, and in charity, and in all that belongs to the existence of an emancipated and regenerated humanity. But this view, however popular, is not only unreal and unhistorical, but it seems to run directly in the face of the plainest teachings of the word of God. This teaches that God is in Christ, and that Christ is the life of the world, and that the world must in some way take part in the great redemption and come to its final consummation in the kingdom of grace and glory.

Take now the process of creation in the beginning—this was plastic, not mechanical. God made the earth by the power of His omnipotence; but it is very clear that He brought order out of chaos, not by mechanical, but by organic force. Whether we take the record of Moses literally and make the creation last only six ordinary days, or whether we accept the

interpretation of modern geological science, and turn these days into grand geologico-historical periods, it makes no difference as to the nature of the fundamental law which governed the whole process from beginning to end. All nature was made to rise by an inherent law and tendency, from one gradation of development to another, under the moulding generic power of the Almighty, until finally the whole culminated in the creation of man, who was made head and lord of the economy in which he stood. Then came the fall, which involved not only formal and judicial issues, such as were imposed in some outward, arbitrary way, but an actual organic corruption of the race, which goes along with every reproductive evolution and reaches every generation that springs from the fallen nature of our common progenitor. As Adam was made a living soul, from whom we have inherited sin and death, so Christ was made a quickening Spirit, through the life and power of whom we shall just as really and effectually be delivered from the curse and misery of sin. For this Christ came in the flesh, was made a man like one of us in all things, only sin excepted, that in His life we might be saved. The order of nature and that of grace, as manifested in Jesus Christ, stand not then in mechanical antagonism, but in organic harmony and union; and as the person of Christ is, so is the order of redemption in the world.

The world is not now as it was eighteen centuries ago, but a radical change has been brought about in its social and moral organization. This change has all the marks of a life, of a power that did not belong to the race since the days of Adam. It is a new life, a new power, which was begotten in the second Adam, and now flows down in history as the hope and joy of the nations. This new life has touched the individual—it has given him proper ideas of his misery, but also of his dignity—it has shown him the hell of sin, with all its degrading consequences, but has joined him also to the fountain of bliss from which he has drawn the inspiration of faith, hope, and charity. The family has also been redeemed by this life; for a new law was given to it—that law which joins one man to

but one woman and allows not the bond to be broken while life lasts. Here lies the secret of the elevation of woman in Christian lands, and of the tender relationship existing between husband and wife, between parents and children, throughout the length and breadth of Christian civilization. Here also we find the key to all the liberal tendencies of modern ideas. Emancipation is the fruit of Christianization, and the former was never accomplished on moral grounds until the latter had been established in the earth. The removal of slavery and all forms of wrong and oppression, has come with the progress of the gospel, with the growth of its benign ideas of humanity, just as naturally as the grass grows under the genial influence of a summer's sun. Our sense of right, of justice, of mercy, of equity, and of every other principle of social, civil, and moral life, is radically different from that of the world as it stood before the birth of Jesus of Nazareth, or as it now stands where it is still under the power of pagan ignorance and superstition. The reason of this difference lies in the fact that Christ has been life and redemption to the world, in so far as the world has received him; but in so far as it has not received him, it remains still in the bondage of ignorance and death.

It is somewhat habitual to our modern temper, to glorify the material developments of the times as one of the chief sources of our high order of civilization. Railroads, telegraphs, mechanical improvements, mining and manufacturing operations, and other data of the same order and kind, are appealed to as the radical cause, as the very womb, of the lofty and sublime ideas and the generous and liberal institutions, by which modern history is characterized. Now, it would be madness to deny that material and mechanical improvements, and the development of mineral and mercantile resources, have a modifying effect on the social, civil, and moral condition of society—all these aid largely in the practical application of moral principles; they are however not sources, but simply instruments of civilization. The material progress of the age has not begotten our civilization, but our civilization, which is the fruition of the life and labors of all Christian ages, has called out and invigo-

rated our material progress. "What is born of the flesh, is flesh"—an evangelical truism which does not only apply in the sphere of religion and morals, but also in the relation of the material to the higher world. The grand structure of Christian civilization, as it now stands, is not the product of any powers of earth, but it hails from heaven; it is the gift of God to man; it has come in the person of his Son and by the historical continuation of his kingdom in the world.

Next to the material interest of the day, we are in the habit of regarding intellectual culture as one of the sure guarantees and prolific sources of modern progress. But the same arguments we have just used with reference to the material order, apply also here. Intellectual culture, as such, can never produce the foundations of our social being, and it has never done so. The Greeks, with an intellectual culture, brilliant and sublime, a culture which has left behind many monuments of greatness and beauty which will be studied and admired while the world stands, never reached the idea of true manhood, and in principle were but little in advance of the most barbarous nations. The foundations of modern society, in all its departments, were laid when Jesus gave the commission—"Go ye into all the world and make all nations disciples, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." Here are the bonds of a common brotherhood among men, who know and worship but one God in Christ Jesus, in whom is broken down the partition wall which separated men from God and from each other; and now there is neither Jew, nor Greek; male, nor female; bond, nor free—they are all baptized into Christ, and hence they are all one in Him. This was the doctrine that was first proclaimed by twelve humble fishermen eighteen hundred years ago, a doctrine which has put to shame the wisdom of the wise, and has produced an order of society such as the world never saw, nor could have seen, had not Jesus been made the life of the world. The Church has ever encouraged intellectual culture, and has made it a powerful lever of popular improvement; but whatever power the intellect has had in the

construction of modern civilization, was derived, not from itself, but from the sublime lessons of the gospel of peace.

It is also sometimes claimed that the benevolent and charitable institutions and habits of the times are a purely human production, and do not owe their existence, in any direct way, to the teachings and life-forces of the gospel. All such claims are, however, clearly and purely arbitrary, and are not supported by the data of history. The world knew no institutions of charity and no public beneficence, until these were reared and maintained by the Church, which, being moved and constrained by the same spirit of self-denial and love that dwelled in her divine-human Head, went forth to relieve and succor the unfortunate, while the world stood sneering, condemning, and persecuting those engaged in this work of Christian mercy. In our day, it is true, we have beneficial societies and benevolent habits, which are in a large measure independent of all positive Christian and churchly associations; but these have not originated benevolent ideas, but benevolent ideas, originated and promulgated long before they were called into existence, have led to the construction of them, and given them life and benevolent vigor. Christ is the life of the world, especially in the sublime work of Christian charity. Infidels and sceptics, while they in their madness attempt to pull down the mighty bulwarks of the true religion, and thus to take away the power and glory of Christ, have used the very weapons which that religion has put into their hands. They have passed along the ecclesiastical horizon as destructive forces, clearing away some obstacles to the truth; but whatever truth they inculcated themselves, they stole from the treasuries of the Church. The rights and privileges which they claimed for man, are only guaranteed in Jesus Christ, and the spirit of His gospel is emphatically the spirit of emancipation and liberty.

Such is the source from which modern civilization has derived its distinctive principles. The power that gave it birth must also maintain it; mere human agencies could not produce it, neither can they preserve it. The issues of the times are ultimately bound up, not with the progress of science or poli-

tics, as such, or with any movement that holds simply in the natural order of things; they lie hid in the Christological ideas that will rule the thinking of the present and the future. The times demand progress, but not that sort of progress which leaves behind the Christological foundations of the past and sets up a gospel of its own. The old creeds, the old faith must forever remain, though its principles and dogmas be applied in a different way. If these foundations are forsaken, there must be a falling back into the helplessness and misery of heathenism—there must be moral and social stagnation and death. Such is the testimony of the word of God, and the voice of history.

ART. VIII.—RATIONALISTIC TENDENCIES OF MODERN THEOLOGY.

BY REV. E. V. GERHART, D.D., FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA.

The orthodox system of practical religion and theology which is predominant among the different denominations of America, adheres firmly, in its own way, to some essential articles of the Christian faith, but does not adhere to all of them. What is rejected is just as necessary as what is received. The discrimination in favor of some truths and against others, has no warrant in Scripture or in the Apostles' Creed. It is arbitrary. The prevailing system could just as consistently reject the articles of faith which it now holds, and hold those which it now rejects. No violence would be done to its principles; for the principle of faith on which some articles are received, would, if consistently held, justify the receiving of all; and the principle of unbelief, or common sense, on which others are repudiated as superstition, if unfolded and applied legitimately, would lead to the rejection of Christianity as a whole.

Certain truths are *received* as important doctrines taught by the Bible: the inspiration of the Books of the Old and New Testament; the Word of God as the only and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice; the unity of essence, and trinity of Persons, in the Godhead; the creation of the world; the fall, depravity and misery of man; the divine nature of our Lord Jesus Christ; His death on the cross, as a sacrifice to the justice of God, for the sins of men; the necessity of repentance and faith, of the new birth by the Holy Ghost, of a life of prayer and holiness, and of divine worship; the sanctity and perpetual obligation of the Sabbath; a final judgment; and the eternal blessedness of the righteous and the eternal misery of the wicked.

These are the leading doctrines of the prevailing system of Christianity. They are held not as objective, concrete facts, but rather as doctrinal opinions, or abstract propositions, drawn from the Bible, the belief of which, by the aid of the Holy Spirit, effects the salvation of souls.

These doctrinal propositions may be taught from two different and opposite points of observation: the will of God, and the will of man. Starting with the sovereign will of God, and reasoning out the truths of revelation in logical order, we get the intellectual system of Calvinism. Starting with the will of man, and reasoning in the same way, we get the emotional system of Arminianism. Calvinism and Arminianism embrace substantially the same propositions concerning the person and work of Christ, and the way of salvation; but the ruling element of thought in one system gives these propositions a position, tone, force and relation peculiar to itself, and thus distinguishes them from the relative character which they possess in the other. Yet both systems, apprehended from a broader principle, are one. Both, as they now stand, overlook and ignore, if they do not deny, the objective presence of Christianity as a real, organic power, or order of divine-human life in the world, and resolve the new creation, somewhat as Fichte did the order of nature, into subjective ideas.

Abstract and subjective as this theory of Christianity is, it rests nevertheless not on experience, not on induction, not on logical demonstration, not on intuition. The doctrine of the incarnation, for example, or of the atonement, is not accessible to the senses; nor can it be established by reasoning from any known facts or from some general self-evident truth. In this way we acquire a knowledge of material objects, of natural laws, of mathematical formulas; but not of truths relating to Christianity, which is supernatural and divine. These are mysteries. The natural understanding cannot comprehend them. They address a higher capacity of the human spirit—the power of receiving and holding for truth that which transcends the grasp of sense and the understanding. This capacity is faith.

The doctrines of the Gospel accordingly address *faith*. We *believe* that the Word was made flesh. We *believe* that the crucifixion of Christ is a propitiatory sacrifice for sin. We do not understand these things. And we do not reject them, because they cannot be understood. On the contrary, we receive them as true, although we are unable to understand them. We receive them because Holy Scripture, as interpreted by the Creeds and Confessions of the Church in every age, contains and teaches them. Holy Scripture being the inspired and infallible word of God, we bow without reserve to their authority, in defiance of the numberless objections and difficulties which the finite human understanding may suggest.

This is the position which the prevailing theology occupies. We find no fault with it. It is correct. We occupy the same general position, however much we may differ in our interpretation of infallible Scripture, or in our view of the nature of Christianity.

But now, it is just this capacity of faith which all the doctrines of the Bible address. The question at issue between what is called Mercersburg Theology and the prevailing evangelical system, is not, whether certain obnoxious doctrines, such as the divine constitution of the Church, the objective efficacy of the Holy Sacraments, and the supernatural character and

power of the office of the ministry, commend themselves to common sense or the natural judgment. Is this the question at issue between Christians and infidels in regard to the incarnation and atonement? or between Protestants and Romanists in regard to the Papacy, the adoration of the Virgin Mary, or the administration of the Eucharist in one kind? Certainly not. No Christian maintains the incarnation against infidels, and no Protestant the administration of the Eucharist in both kinds, against the Romish practice, from the stand-point of common sense. Christians appeal to Christ and His Apostles, from the stand-point of faith in His Person and teachings. Faith is not to be reconciled to common sense, but common sense to faith.

The proper question at issue between Mercersburg and its opponents, is whether these obnoxious doctrines are taught by Christ and the Apostles. Are they contained in Holy Scripture, as interpreted by the ecumenical Creeds and the Confessions of the Protestant Church? Or, for those who believe in the divine nature of Christ, and in Scripture as the ultimate norm of faith, but object to the Creeds and Confessions as a criterion of judgment, the question is, does Holy Scripture, interpreted according to the rules of a sound and valid exegesis, contain the obnoxious doctrines? If not, then by all means renounce them; but not, because they are opposed to common sense and the spirit of the times; renounce them because they are not a part of Christianity, are not found in Holy Scripture, and therefore are not proposed to Christians as an object of faith. But, on the contrary, if the "peculiarities" of Mercersburg Theology are found in Protestant Confessions and in the ancient Creeds; above all, if they are taught by Christ and His Apostles, then they cannot be trifled with and repudiated with impunity; they cannot be condemned as non-essential, superstitious or Romish, without joining issue with Christianity itself from the very stand-point of the rationalist and the infidel. Christianity, with all its doctrines, is above common sense and the natural reason, and contrary to the wisdom of the world and the ruling spirit of the times.

"The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned." Christianity as a whole and in all its parts, is the object of *faith;* and if the "peculiar" doctrines are a part of Christianity, our opponents are most solemnly bound, by their own principle, to receive and defend them; bound just as solemnly and inflexibly as they are to hold the doctrine of the atonement.

Is not this general position correct? What Protestant Christian will gainsay it? Is he not bound by the distinctive features of Protestantism to accept from the heart and firmly hold against every attack, *all the doctrines* of the Bible, whether he can make them clear to his understanding or not? Can he accept some only, and repudiate others? Can he accept some on the principle of faith, and repudiate others on the principle of common sense? These questions answer themselves.

The true issue accordingly concerns the teachings of Holy Scripture. Does so-called Mercersburg Theology hold the truth conformably to the Word of God? This is the point on which we lay emphasis. Our opponents allege that the "peculiar" views of the Mercersburg school are false, dangerous, foolish, unevangelical, Romish, prejudicial to godly living and favorable to dead formalism. We challenge candid, manly, thorough inquiry. Let the "peculiar" theory be tested by the only ultimate standard of truth. We challenge inquiry into the recognized Confessions of Faith of the sixteenth century; into the Apostles' Creed, the universal symbol of the Christian Church; into all the creeds of the post-apostolical period; into the writings of the Fathers, those heroes of Christ who preached and extended the triumphs of the Gospel amid the fiendish persecutions of three centuries; and finally but mainly, into the books of the New Testament. Judged legitimately by this standard, we desire to stand or fall.

Here it is that the opposition betray their disingenuousness and weakness. Excepting the Rev. Dr. Hodge, a man of extensive learning and earnest piety, for whom we, with all who

know him, cherish profound respect, and a few others of less note, none of the scores of editors, professors, ministers and learned laymen who have blown the horn of alarm, and arrayed the hosts of the faithful against one of the little tribes of Israel in bitter antagonism, have ever met the true question in the way of sober and earnest discussion, or even acknowledged that there is really a legitimate question at issue which merits patient investigation on the part of Christian scholars. On the contrary, there has been misrepresentation, wholesale condemnation, one-sided statement, and appeals to popular sentiment and popular prejudice on every side for twenty-five years; all going on the silent presumption that there are no radical defects in the constitution, faith and practice of the American Protestant Church of the nineteenth century, and that any one who undertakes to criticize its doctrinal system or established methods of activity, convicts himself, by the very act, of having taken the first step towards apostacy. So general and long-continued has been this appeal to the judgment and feelings of the people, and so persistent and supercilious has been the refusal to examine the questions at issue fairly and seriously in the light of history and the Word of God, that we feel warranted in drawing the inference that "evangelical" theology really has less faith in the ecumenical creeds and the Word of God itself, than in the prevailing theory and popular religious sentiment.

This inference, we know, involves a serious allegation, but we believe it to be justified by facts. The poison of unbelief, in the form of rationalism, has stealthily insinuated itself into our theology and theological seminaries, into the ministry and their pulpit ministrations, and into our religious literature, so extensively, that the scholarship and the popular habit of the Church is no longer, as a general thing, distinctively Christian, but rather religious only and moral.

There are certain necessary truths, clearly taught in Holy Scripture, which the prevailing "evangelical" mind *rejects*, namely: the objective existence of the Church as the body of Christ; the ever-abiding presence of the Holy Ghost; the ne-

cessity and saving efficacy of Holy Baptism; the nourishing, sanctifying power of the Lord's Supper; the divine character and supernatural powers of the office of the ministry; and, we add, as being in one view fundamental to these, the organic connection, or mystical union, of the human nature of Christ and the members of His Church.

We waive the consideration of the fact, though we do not forget nor ignore it, that this rejection of the churchly, sacramental and mystical side of Christianity involves a perverted view of all other parts or doctrines of revealed truth. But it does not fall in with our present purpose to handle this aspect of the subject.

The Church is not a necessary object of faith for "evangelical" theology. According to its theory, sinners are regenerated by the Holy Spirit working according to the sovereign pleasure of God, and outside and independently of the Holy Sacraments. Then, following the example of the first Christians, these converts form a society of believers, and have certain religious rights and privileges. This society is the Church. It has no authority, or power, but what it derives from the vital godliness of the members, and the external protection and blessing of God. That the Church is a supernatural constitution, divine and human, invisible and visible, more real and powerful than the State or nature itself, it disowns, and even spurns as superstition and folly.

"Evangelical" theology believes in the gift, power and influences of the Spirit, but not in His abiding presence in the Church as His true and proper home. He comes and goes at pleasure. He adds His blessing or not, to the Word, to the administration of the Sacraments, and to words fitly spoken, according to circumstances. But he is not immanent in ordinances, Sacraments, in believers and the body of Christ, as the medium of the divine life and grace of Jesus Christ.

According to this system, the Sacraments are chiefly signs of grace, which grace may or may not be present and active efficiently in the sacramental transaction. They do not certify and confer grace. They do not bestow any spiritual benefit in

virtue of what they are in themselves. There is no sacramental grace; or if there be, it does not operate efficaciously.

This system admits that the minister is a teacher of divine truth, and in some sense a ruler, but denies that he is a priest. Ordination does not invest him with the authority and power of Christ; nor does he perform any functions which are divine acts. The success of his labor depends entirely upon the degree of his faith and piety, his talents and scholarship, his eloquence and tact, and upon the measure of heavenly blessing with which God may favor his preaching of the Gospel; but not on the divine powers of his office, not on his authority to administer the Sacraments, and to remit or retain sin in the sense of Christ's words: John xx. 23.

"Evangelical" theology denies the human life-union of Christ and believers. It consents to a legal union, a moral union, and an emotional union. Christ and His people stand in the same relation to the law; and they think, will, and feel alike. It consents also to a certain life-union of God and believers effected by the Holy Ghost; but not to a life-union mediated by the human nature of Christ. It denies that Christ, the God-*man* is the Source and Head of a new, regenerated order of humanity, bearing an organic relation to Him, as the second Adam, like that which the old, fallen humanity bears to the first Adam.

The rejection of this class of scriptural doctrines proceeds on *a principle* which we must consider, in order to estimate properly the tendencies of the modern system of "evangelical" theology.

The ground on which this part of Christianity is rejected, is not that sacramental ideas are contrary to the confessional standards of the Protestant Church. Did the opposition plant itself on this basis, it would be consistent with some respect for authority, and with reverence for the great Reformers of the sixteenth century. But, with a few exceptions, our opponents of every name, while denouncing the *Mercersburg Review* as anti-Reformed and anti-Protestant, have steadily refused to compare, in the spirit of candid Christian scholarship, the pre-

vailing religious system with Protestant formularies of faith, and have even ignored them as a criterion of judgment.

Nor is this class of scriptural doctrines rejected because they are contrary to the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, or to the faith of the fathers of the Church who flourished during the second, third and fourth centuries. The truth is, our opponents set no value on the three great Creeds as standards of faith. They are only relics; useless relics, like the pyramids, of the dead and buried past. They betray the infantile simplicity of their age, and warn the wisdom of the nineteenth century of concealed under-currents of superstition. The very fact that the *Mercersburg Review* has exhumed these ancient monuments, exposed them to the eyes of men, proclaimed them beacon lights to floating Protestantism, has incurred both contempt and abuse. With one proud wave of the hand, the "evangelical" system sets aside these mighty achievements of the Christian Church, and even ridicules their claim to authority as a subordinate rule of faith.

The "evangelical" system imagines that it can overleap, at one bound, the entire history of the Church. It professes to go directly to the Bible, as if the mediatorial reign of Christ on earth, and the presence of the Holy Ghost for eighteen centuries, were a blank. But our opponents contradict themselves. They refuse to do what they continually boast of doing. While they profess to be governed by Holy Scripture alone, they nevertheless do not reject this class of obnoxious doctrines on Scriptural grounds. The whole controversy just assumes at once that the prevailing system of theology and practical religion, is the Bible system. That is settled, in its judgment, beyond a doubt. And on this assumption the rejection seems to rest. There is, in consequence, no earnest investigation of Scripture in its bearing on the obnoxious doctrines. No matter what amount of argument is drawn from the teachings of Christ and His Apostles in support of the organic connection subsisting between the human nature of Christ and His people, or in support of the divine-human constitution of the Church, the supernatural efficacy of Holy Baptism, or the divine authority and divine powers of

the office of the ministry, very few, if any, of our opponents take up the scriptural argument, and pursue it patiently in the light of all the proper aids to interpretation. One class of Scripture passages is carefully studied and expounded, because they support a certain class of received doctrines; but another class of passages, just as prominent, as numerous, as unequivocal, and just as important in the estimation of the New Testament writers, is rarely if ever expounded, and many of them never even quoted in support of any proposition; and for the simple reason, that these passages are associated with the obnoxious doctrines, and sound so much like the language in which these doctrines are stated, that it is not profitable nor convenient to meddle with them. If, however, this class of passages is taken up at all, it is done in order to eviscerate them of their plain, direct sense, under a species of criticism like that which Unitarians apply to the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, or the first chapter of Colossians.

If the prevailing system would reject this class of doctrines on any one of or on all the grounds just stated, the posture of "evangelical" theology would be less dangerous. To acknowledge the proper authority of Protestant Confessions, and honor them as a subordinate rule of faith; to recognize the superior authority of the ancient Creeds, and honor them as the bearers of the undoubted Christian truth; and to study Holy Scripture through the aid of the Christian consciousness of all ages, in other words, in the light of the Confessions and Creeds of the Church Catholic;—would imply faith in the uninterrupted presence of Christ by the Holy Spirit, and in the continuous life of the Church; would hold the prevailing system in legitimate relation to history and to the Bible, and thus shut out compromise with the unbelieving spirit of Rationalism; even though, supposing it possible, in the interpretation of Confessions and Creeds, and through them of the Word of God itself, the system would be constrained to repudiate the very class of Christian doctrines which it now repudiates. It is not simply the fact that certain doctrines are denounced, but the

spirit and manner in which it is done, that betrays serious incipient defection from the Christianity of the New Testament.

The obnoxious doctrines are repudiated mainly on *rational grounds*. This is the underlying principle. There are *two* ways in which the principle may operate.

In the *first* place, the rationalistic principle may work under the guise of the opposite principle of faith, or supreme respect for the Bible. Ignoring the necessity and reality of intervening history, it goes directly to the letter of the Bible, and professes to obtain all its knowledge of Christianity *de novo*, from the sacred record. It may seem to be a misnomer and a contradiction, to call such apparently pure reverence for Holy Scripture rationalistic. Yet it is really this and nothing more.

What does such a direct, overleaping, independent investigation of Holy Scripture imply? What does it assume?

It implies that an individual living in the nineteenth century does, in reality, stand in such immediate connection with the books of the New Testament; that no formative educational forces mediate his judgment of the contents of these books, but that his knowledge and belief are conditioned and determined exclusively by contact of his independent mind with the letter of the Scriptures; an assumption that is both false and absurd. A man's judgment of Christianity bears a relation to the judgment of past ages, like that which his natural existence bears to his ancestors. The relation is concrete, not abstract. Any Christian's view of the teachings of the Bible is the result of a process of life and thought that has been going on in the world, under the moulding power of the Holy Ghost, from the beginning; the process at every stage of its progress, and at all points, being modified and conditioned by numberless events and forces, all of which affect the result, whatever it may be, in any age, or in any person. In the nature of the case, the past becomes authority for the present; and is such always, and in fact, in some form at least, whether duly acknowledged or not.

Knowledge is born from the womb of its own age. One period of time and thought begets another; and that the next following; and so on successively *ad infinitum*. This law asserts

itself in civil affairs, in jurisprudence, in art, science, and philosophy, no less than in the sphere of Christian theology and practical religion. The opinion of a judge may indeed be an advance upon all previous decisions, but in order to be an advance it must be based upon a thorough knowledge of, and due respect for the past history of legal opinions. Were it not thus grounded in the past it would possess no worth nor authority. The leading ideas of our federal constitution can be seen flashing through the history of many centuries. The particular form of expression which they have now obtained marks but an advanced stage of development. So are every man's views of Christianity connected immediately with the reigning mind of the age in which he lives, and through it with the mind of preceding ages.

To say, now, that a man's views of Christian truth are, or may be determined immediately by the study of the Bible, is just as absurd, as to attempt the creation of a new school of art, or philosophy, on the presumption that art or philosophy had never had an existence in the world; or, as it would be to maintain that a new-born infant does not descend from the first man through a succession of families by the law of natural generation, but is, as were Abel and Cain, the child of Adam himself.

This professed pure reverence for the Word of God, and independence of the historical process of theological and religious knowledge, is at bottom a negation by the human reason of the divine order of Christian life and faith. Instead of being a docile learner of revealed truth from Holy Scripture through the medium of the general consciousness of the Church—just as in other spheres men must acquire the knowledge of law, medicine, and government—one man, or a class of men, affirms the superior ability of the enlightened reason of the present age. Though separated from the Scriptures by eighteen centuries, these men subject them to the apprehension of their isolated rational powers; and affirm that Christianity is neither more nor less than what they, from their narrow, circumscribed position, are able to learn from the sacred record.

What is this but the essence of rationalism? What but the

pride of human intellect? What but the reason of one man, or of a class of men, or of a single generation, falling back upon its own limited resources, and affirming its decision, the result of the exercise of its own powers in its own way, to be divine truth and divine law?

To study the Holy Scriptures by a method so abstract and abnormal, serves to make private judgment the criterion of the doctrines which they teach. Hence, we will notice, *secondly*, the more direct form in which the rationalistic principle is working in modern theology.

We have said that the obnoxious doctrines are repudiated mainly on *rational* grounds. The human reason becomes the test of revealed truth. The class of doctrines of which we have spoken, is repudiated, because they do not commend themselves to the judgment of the nineteenth century. What interpretations of Scripture commend themselves to human judgment and feeling are received. No others. These vary with the intellectual posture of the age. An interpretation that comes with convincing force to one generation, may be set aside as antiquated by another. What one rejects, the next may adopt. The mind of the Protestant nationalities is living, active mind; not stagnant like that of China. Thought, sentiment, feeling is changing and moving; affected and modified by the progress of art, the discoveries of science, the appliances of education, the convulsions and revolutions of States, and the deep undercurrents of philosophy. All these serve to determine the posture and character of the mind, and the method of thinking of the present day. Professing to go *directly* to the Bible, in the nature of the case, interpretation must be affected by the reigning method of thought; that is, the apprehension of Scripture is governed by the understanding of one person, or class, or age. Man determines what is and what is not revealed truth in the dim, uncertain, flickering light that shines forth from himself. What is this but rationalism?

Repudiating as it does the law of historical judgment, the modern system of theology and practical religion cannot but be at heart rationalistic.

It refuses to be governed by the confessional standards of Protestantism, as a subordinate rule of faith and practice.

It refuses to be governed by the three great ecumenical creeds of the Christian Church.

It refuses to occupy a docile attitude towards the writers of the second, third, and fourth centuries, boldly renouncing all respect for the Apostolic and patristic traditions of the primitive period.

Especially does it refuse to recognize the authority of the Apostles' Creed, that universal symbol of faith of the entire Christian Church, Protestant and Catholic, as a *rule of faith.*

What alternative remains but that, in the effort to make the Scriptures the immediate and exclusive object of investigation, the mind of the age turn to itself, and depend upon its own powers of apprehension and reasoning? And the result must be determined by the peculiar attitude of these mental powers, and the kind of reasoning that underlies the interpretation put upon the sacred writings. Hence it is that all those truths and doctrines that do not tally with the prevailing sentiment and the spirit of the times, are set aside or explained away.

It must be evident, moreover, that the rejection of Christian doctrines cannot be limited to that class which is now so generally assailed. On the principle of independent human judgment, the theory of inspiration may be renounced as easily as the theory of sacramental grace; the doctrine of the Trinity, as easily as the mystical union of believers with the human nature of Christ; and justification by faith, as easily as the divine authority and the divine powers of the office of the ministry. Objectively considered, there is no reason for discrimination in favor of some of these doctrines and against others; for all alike include a supernatural element. None are accessible to sentiment, or understanding, or reason, or the spirit of the age. To eliminate one fact or truth because it is unreasonable, involves a principle that must, when applied with logical consistency, eliminate all Christian mysteries. The principle establishes a strong tendency towards general unbelief. The mind that refuses to believe in the objective, divine-human con-

stitution of the Church, or the efficacious virtue of the Holy Sacraments, because such ideas are not reasonable, or because they are dangerous to the rights and independence of the people, only needs time and occasion to develop, and demonstrate, satisfactorily to itself, the unreasonableness of the old theory that God, by means of illiterate farmers, shepherds and fishermen, composed in Hebrew and Greek, and by miraculous interposition preserved a series of books on religion and morals: a theory that is warranted neither by experience nor observation, nor supported by logical reasoning, but must be accepted on the principle of believing what cannot be proved, nor understood, nor conceived.

These tendencies towards general unbelief are now actively at work in the religious mind of America. They are sustained and nourished by some of the most prominent and popular agencies. In this rationalistic element stands the *New York Observer*, for example, one of the most prominent and influential religious weekly periodicals in the United States. In many respects a very excellent publication, setting its face like a flint against every species of immorality and vice, and supporting religion and virtue, it nevertheless fails to hold and teach all the essential doctrines of Christianity. It rejects the entire churchly and sacramental side of revealed truth, holds itself bound only by its own direct interpretation of the Bible, and seems to take pleasure in misstating and caricaturing the faith of the primitive Church, and the original faith of Protestantism. While nobly battling with many of the errors of rationalism, it concedes the germinal principle from which these very fatal errors have grown forth. Every Socinian, Unitarian and Rationalist, in Europe or America, is in full sympathy with its antagonism to the ancient faith of the Christian Church.

On the same general basis stands also the *American Tract Society*. We honor its zeal, and benevolence, and self-denying labors. We honor it for proposing to itself as its only end, the promotion of the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. But we cannot honor its meagre faith, and arbitrary elimination of revealed truth. Professing to teach

the whole truth concerning the way of salvation in Christ, it rules out, as unnecessary and superfluous, the means of salvation appointed by Christ Himself, and reverently observed by the Church from the beginning amid all her persecutions and vicissitudes down to the present day; and inculcates a theory of regeneration that is not warranted by one confession of faith or creed of the Reformation period. Just as German rationalism accepts one book, or one part of a book, of the New Testament as genuine, and rejects others, so does the *Tract Society* eliminate one part of the original Protestant faith, and then promulgate another part, in its peculiar style, as being all that is necessary to eternal salvation.

Our opponents allege that we condescend to calling names. This is a great mistake. We do not indulge in trifling. There is no occasion for violations of Christian courtesy. We cherish no feeling towards them but that of personal respect. But there is at issue a question of profound theological significance and immense practical importance; and it is necessary to give to the ruling religious spirit of the times its proper name. Hence we maintain with all seriousness, that the tendencies of modern theology are *rationalistic.*

If these tendencies are not checked and supplanted by a deeper and more complete view of Christianity; if the *principle* of German rationalism is not earnestly studied and consciously renounced; if modern theology does not break the fetters of a false method of abstract, mechanical thinking, and return to the elevated sphere of *faith;* the rationalistic spirit will ripen into open infidelity in the bosom of American Protestantism, and the defection that has fallen like a blight upon the Protestant Churches of Germany, France, Holland, and other portions of Europe, will be repeated on a broad scale in the new world.

ART. IX.—ATHANASIAN CREED.

BY J. W. NEVIN, D.D., FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA.

It is admitted now on all hands, that this well known symbol, called also sometimes the *Quicunque*, from the word with which it begins in its Latin form, *Quicunque vult salvus esse*, &c., has not come down to us from the great Athanasius himself. It takes its title from him simply because it claims to be a full and clear statement of the faith to which he bore witness, and which has become identified with his name; while the manner in which it carries out its specifications of what is involved in this faith, as well as the historical notices we have concerning it, show plainly that it was formed long after his time. As the Apostles' creed gives us in summary form the fundamental facts of Christianity as they were held to be derived from the teaching of the Apostles themselves, so the Athanasian creed is the doctrine of Athanasius in regard to the Trinity, drawn out in orthodox propositions over against all such conceptions as were felt to overthrow it for the Christian consciousness; this, moreover, in a form which answers especially to the way in which the doctrine was carried out and completed in the Latin or Western Church, where from the time of Augustine the procession of the Holy Ghost was made to refer itself to the Son (as in this creed) no less than to the Father. This of itself shows the Latin origin of the symbol; as we have the original form of it plainly also only in the Latin text, in which it first comes to our view in the seventh century. Greek writers of the period following Athanasius make no mention of it; and it is for the most part, either wanting altogether in manuscript copies of his works, or noted as being ascribed to him improperly. It is somewhat striking that the term *consubstantial*, the original Nicene test word (*ὁμοούσιος*), is not introduced into the formulary at all.

When, where, and by whom the Athanasian creed was composed has not been, and perhaps never can be, satisfactorily determined. Some have ascribed it, on plausible but yet uncertain grounds, to Vigilius, bishop of Tapsus in Africa, who lived toward the close of the fifth century; while others attribute it to Vincent of Lerins in the middle of the same century. *Waterland* supposes the author of it to have been Hilary of Arles. *Gieseler* conjectures (in his Church History) that it originated in Spain, as late at least as the seventh century, in connection with Trinitarian and Christological controversies which were continued there down to that time; and that it passed from this country afterwards into Gaul, during the course of the following century. But it seems more probable on the whole, that it had its origin altogether earlier than this in Gaul itself, either in the second half of the fifth century, or in the beginning of the sixth. It is possible, however, that it may have been brought to pass, not all at once, but gradually, like the Apostles' creed; which would account for what seem to be words and passages taken from it in several writers of the fifth and sixth centuries, while there is no notice of full Latin copies of it earlier than the seventh century. It was in Gaul, at all events, that the creed first came into general favor and use; so as to be placed in one rank, as a standard of the Christian faith, with the Apostolic and Nicene symbols: an authority which was conceded to it afterwards throughout the whole Western Church. In the Greek Church, the Athanasian creed, when it first became known after the tenth century, encountered serious opposition, especially on account of its teaching the procession of the Spirit from the Son; subsequently, however, it was accepted with some modifications; although never so as to reach the same extensive use which it was allowed to have in the Latin world. From the Catholic Church it came down in full authority to the Protestant. Luther says of it: "The creed of St. Athanasius is so composed, that I know not if anything more weighty or glorious has been written in the Church of the New Testament since the time of the Apostles."

From the twelfth century onward there seems to have been, throughout the Catholic world, full faith in the Athanasian origin of the creed; and this belief prevailed also without examination among Protestants, down till near the middle of the seventeenth century; when *Gerhard John Vossius*, a Dutch Reformed theologian, made it the subject of a critical dissertation, which had the effect of turning the opinion of the world with regard to it in an entirely new direction. The arguments against the authorship of Athanasius were found to be so strong, that it has been almost universally given up by later historians and critics, both Protestant and Catholic. In certain directions, this discovery of error in the received tradition concerning the origin of the symbol has been felt as a sort of shock to the credit of the symbol itself. But rightly considered, it has in truth nothing to do with this whatever; even less, we may say, than the wrong origin ascribed to the Apostles' creed has to do with the true authority of that symbol, considered as an apostolical rule of faith; and just as little, at all events, as the question of its Pauline origin has to do with the inspiration or canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Athanasius himself was neither inspired nor infallible; and the mere fact of the creed's having been composed by him would not have given it the weight of an œcumenical symbol under any circumstances, except as it might have been accepted and responded to subsequently by the Church at large as a true expression of its faith. But this precisely is the œcumenical character in which it has come down to us in fact, without being the work of Athanasius; while it gives us not simply his faith as he held it for his own time, but this faith interpreted and defined still farther in its relations and applications, for the mind of the general Church, by the great theological issues through which it was required to pass in times following. In this respect, the Athanasian creed is of far wider significance, and of far greater consequence, for the Christian Church, than it could ever have been possibly as the mere work of the great Athanasius himself.

Works on the Athanasian creed: *G. J. Vossius*, De tribus Symbolis, Amstel. 1642; *Montfaucon*, Diatribe de Symbolo Quicunque, in his edition of the Works of Athanasius; *J. H. Heidegger*, De Symbolo Athanasiano; *J. G. Walch*, Introductio in libros ecclesiæ Luth. Symbolicos; *Köllner*, Symbolik aller christlichen Confessionen; *Dan. Waterland*, Critical History of the Athanasian Creed, Cambridge, 1724; *John Dennis*, The Athanasian Creed, 1815; *W. W. Harvey*, History and Theology of the Three Creeds, London, 1856; *P. Schaff*, The Athanasian Creed, Mercersb. Review, April, 1859.

Art. X.—OUR RELATIONS TO GERMANY.

BY J. W. NEVIN, D.D., FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA.

It has been occasionally charged against our theology heretofore, that it consisted very much in a blind following of German modes of thought. Because it made large account of German learning, and of the results of German speculation in the different departments of theological science, it was considered proper to make the fact a reason for viewing its peculiarities with suspicion and distrust. This could be done in different ways to suit occasions. Sometimes it had the purpose simply of disparaging our views, as being without any sort of original force. Again, it was to hold them up to contempt, as unintelligible and obscure; German thinking, at best, being a sort of dreamy idealism, and *our* version of it of course an incompetent rendering into English, that was sure to turn it into something worse. What came in such form was of questionable shape. It might be set down at once as transcendental nonsense; in so far forth precisely as it failed to fall in with the stereotyped notions of those whose perspicacity, thanks to their want of all German training, had never become clouded by any similar mysticism. Then again, however, the charge of

Germanizing was pitched upon a new key. Could any good thing, in the way of Christianity and theology, come out of Germany? Was it not the land of neology, rationalism, and pantheism? Had not its philosophy, from Kant to Hegel, been in the service throughout of skepticism and unbelief; and was it not notorious that its old religious orthodoxy had been swept away completely by the influence of its philosophical speculations? To be in any communication with German thinking, in such circumstances, was counted enough in certain quarters to justify the apprehension of a somewhat latitudinarian or unsound faith. The idea seemed to be, that a man was the more to be relied upon as a competent scholar in philosophical, theological, and moral science, the *less* he knew of the great writers on these subjects in modern Germany. Rauch's Psychology, for example, might have been better without the knowledge of Hegel; it detracted from the value of his Lectures on Ethics, that he had studied Fichte and was thoroughly familiar with the teaching of Daub; and that Mercersburg theology, as it was called, should find any thing at all to admire or approve in the magnificent Schleiermacher, was held sufficient to bring upon it the reproach of all his errors. Here, moreover, was ground for looking askant on its professed regard for the first class of evangelical German theologians generally belonging to the present time. For who among them had not been influenced, more or less, by the thinking of Schleiermacher? It was no help to our cause then, that it could plead in its favor at certain points the authority of such men as Neander, or Ullmann, or Julius Müller, or Dorner, or Rothe, or Ebrard, or Martensen, or Liebner, or Tholuck, or Lange. These might be all good enough for Germany; but they could not pass muster here, of course, among the evangelical sects of America; and any school or tendency among us, therefore, that might pretend to be in good understanding with them theologically, could but deserve for this very reason, to be looked upon with some measure of misgiving and doubt.

We have been blamed heretofore, we say, in these different ways, for being too much ruled by the authority of the Ger-

mans in matters of theology and religion; and many are no doubt still ready, as much as ever, to renew the blame on what they may feel to be suitable occasion. It is somewhat surprising, however, to find this charge against us turned of late into precisely the opposite form. On the strength of an opinion got at second hand from Dr. Dorner, in regard to our new Liturgy, occasion is taken to make it out that our views are *not* endorsed by the standard-bearers of modern evangelical theology in Germany, and that this now must be taken as a powerful presumption against them without any farther consideration. If it was our heresy before to be too much German, it is our no less serious heterodoxy now to be too little German. The case of difference with us on the part of Dorner, is indeed ludicrously small. It reduces itself to a single point, set over against three other main points, in which he agrees with us in full, against those who wish to overwhelm us with his condemnation. Dorner is in favor of a true people's Liturgy; Dorner approves of our seeking to incorporate the spirit of the primitive Liturgies with the theological life of the sixteenth century; Dorner declares the sacramental doctrine of our Liturgies to be the true doctrine of the Reformed Church as it was taught by Calvin in the age of the Reformation. All great points, on which the Puritanic anti-liturgical party among us, and on the outside of us, has been at issue with us, more or less angrily, all along. But then, the same Dr. Dorner takes exception, it is said, to our view of Ordination and the Christian Ministry, pronounces it Anglican (not German), and sees involved in it the conception of a third sacrament not in proper harmony with Protestantism; and this at once is seized upon as sufficient to turn his otherwise favorable judgment into a wholesale testimony against us, with which, it is complacently assumed, we ought to feel ourselves altogether confounded and put to shame. With the Christological theology of Dorner, Ullmann, and other such German divines, the Puritanic anti-liturgical party among us, and on the outside of us, have in the nature of the case no sympathy whatever. It is that order of thinking precisely which they are ever ready to exclaim against as unevangelical,

whenever it comes in their way. But in the case before us, all that is forgotten. To serve an occasion now, these German authorities (though they are themselves mostly *not* Reformed at all, but either Lutheran or Unionistic), are made to be an infallible standard for the German Reformed Church here in America, which we, as belonging to that Church, are bound to respect, on pain of being held heretical for any deviation from it whatever. The authorities in question, it is well known, are not in full harmony among themselves, and agree with no sect or confession in this country; but no matter for that; if they can be made to tell against our so-called Mercersburg theology in any way, it is at any rate so much clear gain. Does not this theology claim to be German, as professing to represent the German Reformed Church? But here we have the Germans themselves objecting to at least something in it, as not according to their mind. Is not that enough to condemn it?

It is hard enough certainly, that we should have charged upon us as a fault in this case, what it has been considered our fault at other times to be wanting in; the power, namely, of not following blindly in the wake of German theological speculation. But let it pass. We are used to such unfair polemics. All we have in mind now, is the improvement of the occasion here offered, for setting forth in general terms briefly what our relations to Germany have been actually all along, and still continue to be, in the whole sphere of religion and theology.

We honor German learning and thought, and stand largely indebted to them for such views as we have come to have of man and the world, of Christianity and the Bible. We are not of that class who pique themselves on being good philosophers, because they have never read a line of Kant and have not the remotest conception of what was dreamed of by Fichte and Schelling; or who consider themselves good and safe theologians, because their dogmatic slumbers have never been for a moment disturbed by Schleiermacher or the dangerous school of Tübingen. We confess our obligations both to the philosophers and the theologians of Germany. They have done much to deepen our religious convictions, and to widen the range of

our religious thought. We are perfectly sure that the central stream of all spiritual science in the modern life of the world, is in that country; and that it is worse than idle, therefore, to dream of any live, progressive thinking, philosophical or theological, in England, America, or any other country, which shall not be impregnated largely with the results of German study and speculation.

With all this high opinion, however, of the German mind and learning, we belong to no German school, and have never pretended to follow strictly any German system or scheme of thought. Neither have we been blind at all, or insensible, to the dangers of a too free and trustful communication with these foreign forms of thinking. There has been no disposition with us, either to commit ourselves passively to any such guidance, or to set up an independent system by its help. We have all along disclaimed every thing of this sort. Theory and speculation have been with us subordinate always to the idea of positive Christianity, as an object of faith exhibited to us in the Bible and the history of the actual Church. The Christological principle has been for us immeasurably more than the requirements of any school of philosophy; its practical consequences have weighed more with us than the logical necessities of any metaphysical system. We have been able to see and own thankfully the service which has been rendered to the cause of Christianity, through the intonation of this great principle, by Schleiermacher, and other master minds, who have here followed him with far more orthodoxy than he ever had himself, without feeling ourselves bound in the least to accept in full all that any such master mind may have been led to deduce from the principle as belonging to the right construction of Christian doctrine. Our theology in this view has not been built upon Schleiermacher or Ullmann, or Dorner, however much of obligation it cheerfully owns to each of them, as well as to others, whose more or less variant systems of thought go together to make up the conception of what is called the evangelical theology of Germany in its most modern form.

Whatever of force and worth the Christological studies of

these great men carry with them for our thinking, all is felt to rest ultimately only in their bearing on the actual life of Christ, and the relation they hold to the development of the mystery of godliness in the actual history of the Church. Here we reach what we feel to be surer and more solid ground than any such studies of themselves furnish; and just because these studies seem too often to stop short of what is involved for faith in the full historical apprehension of the Christian mystery, as a continuous presence in the world, they are found to be at certain points more or less unsatisfactory in the end to our religious feeling. Here it is that, with all our respect for German divinity, we consciously come to a break with it in our thoughts, and feel the necessity of supplementing it with the more practical way of looking at Christianity which we find embodied in the ancient Creeds. In this respect, we freely admit, our theology is more Anglican than German. We stand upon the old Creeds. We believe in the Holy Catholic Church.

In this way the Church Question, in particular, has come to have for us an interest and significance which it has not, and cannot have, even for the best thinkers in Germany. With us, the whole Christological interest is felt to run into it as its necessary issue and end. The Church challenges our faith as an essential part of the Christian salvation; a mystery, to the acknowledgment of which we are shut up by the inward movement of the Creed. But in Germany, they cannot look at the matter in the same way. Their circumstances forbid it. Their churches are dependent on the State, are ruled by civil authority, have no proper ecclesiastical authority or power of their own. How, standing in the bosom of such Erastian systems, can German theologians be considered good authority for any thing that has to do with the proper solution of the Church Question? We profess no agreement with them here, and ask from them no endorsement of our views. We know that we stand upon higher ground. Who among us can think of accepting Rothe's idea of the Church, by which it is made to merge itself at last formally in the Christian State? Who that has had the least insight into the miserable church relations of

the late Dr. Ullmann, Prelate so called of the Church in Baden, would be willing to take him as a sound expositor of what the article of the Church means in the Apostles' Creed? And just so with the judgment of the excellent Dr. Dorner, quoted against our Liturgy on the subject of Ordination. It is only what was to be expected. It carries with it for us no weight whatever. God forbid that we should be bound here by Prussian examples or Prussian opinions in any form.

Art. XI.—FALSE INTERPRETATION.

BY DANIEL GANS, D. D., NORRISTOWN, PA.

"FOR MY FATHER IS GREATER THAN I."—*John* xiv. 28.

We are not surprised that the unbelieving are found to take peculiar interest in those passages of Holy Scripture which they can pervert in favor of their own purposes. They cannot rid themselves entirely of the claims of the Bible. They cannot wholly cast it away as a "cunning device"—as an imposition practiced upon the credulity of men—as a deceit which has deceived the world. This would be going too far. This would be condemned by the good solid sense of all communities. Aye, this would be monstrous even in the eyes of their own consciences. No one man can expect to establish the conviction that all the world is crazy, and that he only is sane. Nevertheless, where they can find a passage which may seem to aim a stab at some vital point in the Christian system, which may, by a false construction, or by tearing it out of its proper connection, or by regarding the sound rather than the sense, be made apparently to undermine any one of the great pillars upon which divine revelation rests, you will find them to take a very active interest in it. You will find them very forward to refer to such passages; and when they do refer to them, you will notice a peculiar light kindling in their eye, and

a warm glow spreading over their countenances, indicating that now they have found the gospel best adapted to their spirits.

The words which we have quoted above, is one of these passages. You will notice how often, and with what a triumphant glee, they are quoted by this class of persons. They are taken to be a candid acknowledgment, by the Saviour Himself, of His *essential* inequality as compared with God—hence to be a refutation at once of all the claims which have been set up in favor of His divinity, and a sweeping away of the *delusions* of men, as they say, which mean, in fact, the fondest hopes which the human soul can have in reference to eternity. It is well, therefore, to advert to such passages, with a view to break the force of cunning falsehood which has been put into them, and to bring out the simple truth which they contain. This is our object with the present text: "For my Father is greater than I."

And (1) let us ask the mind tainted with the leaven of unbelief—Art thou quite sure that the Saviour, in these words, acknowledges an *essential* inferiority to the Father? If He does, we then ask, what is the meaning of the words, *My Father?* Think of this phrase. Here is the relation of *Father and Son.* This much, at least, is secured by the text itself. But now does not the Son bear the *nature* of the Father? This you must also concede, as you cannot tell how a son can do otherwise than take and bear the nature of his father. If Christ then is the Son of God, and does, on this account, bear in Him the nature of God, then how is He *essentially* different from God or inferior to Him? for the word *essentially* comes from the word *essence.* If the Son has the same *essence*, then the conclusion is, that He is *essentially* the same with the Father whatever differences there may exist between them in other respects. We therefore conclude that, though Christ was inferior to the Father in some respects, He was not *essentially* inferior. It was on account of His possessing the same essence that, on another occasion, He said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Let this fact, then, be borne in mind,

that in the text itself is secured the *essential* equality of God and Christ, as Father and Son.

In what sense, then, (2) is Christ, according to the text, inferior to God? It requires no long train of abstruse reasoning to find the true answer. It is at hand for all who will for a moment look calmly at the subject. He was inferior in *condition*—not in essence, but in state, or circumstances. He was in the world. The Father was in heaven. In leaving heaven and coming to the world, you can already see a mighty difference in condition. The Father was in heaven—the Son on earth—the Father on the throne, the Son, for the time-being, a subject. When He undertook our salvation, he voluntarily assumed the humble condition which the case required. Hence we hear the Scriptures saying: "Though He was rich, yet for our sake He became poor." Again: "He humbled Himself (ταπείνωσέν εαυτον—*debased Himself*), and became obedient." Again: "He made Himself of no reputation (εαυτον εκενωσε—*He emptied Himself*), took upon Him the form of a servant." So throughout—all descriptive of the difference of *condition*, resulting from His own volition, between Christ in the world and Christ in heaven.

This same thought lies in the context: "*Potestatem habeo ponendi eam, et potestatem habeo iterum Sumendi eam.*" The time had come when Christ was about to leave the world, go back to His Father, and resume his original condition of glory and exaltation. Hence He says to His disciples: "If ye loved me, ye would *rejoice*, because I said I go unto my Father." Why rejoice? "Because my Father is greater than I"—because He is in a more exalted condition—greater in respect to state, power, glory—all which Christ voluntarily resigned when He undertook the cause of human redemption. Now, having *descended* for our sakes, He is about to ascend; and if their love for Him was true and real, they would not be sad or melancholy, but rejoice, because He was about to assume a higher and happier condition: "Because I go to my Father;" for true love rejoices in proportion as the object of it is exalted and made happy. Therefore we say that, since the words of this

passage were uttered with immediate and direct reference to His *change of condition*, they must mean that the difference in respect to *greatness*, which they indicate, must be a difference arising from *condition*, and not from nature or essence. Christ was now in His state of humiliation, and was about to exchange it for that of exaltation. There is, therefore, nothing here to disparage the Saviour's divinity and equality with the Father. On the other hand, we find a direct proof and confirmation of it. How? Thus: If He was now in a state that was not natural to Him,—a mere transitory state; and if He was now about to return to a state that was natural to Him; and if that state to which He was about to return was one of *association* with the Father, you have a state of *equality*. In this state He has been since the Ascension. Therefore, let not this Scripture be perverted.

Inference 1. We should not depend on *sound*, but *substance*, in the interpretation of the Word of God.

Inference 2. We should study the *states* of our Saviour.

Inference 3. His states indicate *ours*—ours rather like His. *We* are less now than we will be by and by. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is."

ART. XII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

CYCLOPÆDIA OF BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE. Prepared by *Rev. John McClintock, D. D.*, and *James Strong, S. T. D.* Vol. I.—A, B. New York: Harper & Bros. 1867.

Such a work in English has long been needed. While German scholars have been over provided for, in this department, there has been a decided lack in English. The field which all literary men have to comprehend is so large, that such works of reference are indispensable; and what a world of knowledge is thus also placed within the reach of all who seek information on various points in the biblical, theological and historical sphere. The work before us takes a wide scope, but not too wide. It is "to be completed in about six volumes (say eight) royal octavo of about 1000 pages each." The volume before us of 947 double column pages, covers the letters A and B. "The remaining volumes are in rapid progress, and will appear at short intervals." The editors, themselves ripe scholars, are assisted by a large corps of able co-laborers. Free use is made of all former Encyclopædias, but "every article has either been re-written *de novo*, or thoroughly revised, with reference to the more recent literature on each topic." The articles on the several Christian denominations, have either been prepared by men connected with them, or have been submitted to one among them for examination and correction. This gives to each, to say the least, a fair chance of being correctly understood. This is perhaps the best that can be done in the case, as it is very difficult for any one to make himself sufficiently *objective*, as the Germans are wont to say, to set forth a religious movement as from the mouth of one who stands in it. The editors themselves are Methodists, and "the whole work," we are told, "is of course prepared from the editors' point of view as to theology, but at the same time, it is hoped, in no narrow or sectarian spirit." Of course, as Methodists they must necessarily occupy that stand-point, and there is a good chance and, at the same time, a strong temptation, to make a great many facts of history and theology face that way; yet the editors have a literary reputation to sustain in their work, which, with the free necessity of Christian fairness, will no doubt, act as adequate conservator. Besides, if the work should come to be partial, its authority would at once be forfeited with the discovery. We are in hope that this work will show that Americans, as well as Germans, can be *objective*, which in this case is the same as very honest. To find faults in a work of this character would be as easy for one only on such lookout, as it is for certain kind of birds to find carcasses in the bosom of a charming landscape. Our taste does not run in that way. We feel rather like accepting gratefully so great a service done by Drs.

McClintock and Strong. The work into which compilation so largely enters, is, of course, not as *gründlich* as Herzog's, but as American and English and later than Herzog, it takes in many topics, especially in biography, which are not found in that great work. The Cyclopædia is gotten up in good style by the Harpers, and copiously illustrated, which is a feature of additional interest especially to the natural history of the Biblical department. In cloth $5 per volume, in sheep $6, in half morocco $8.

BAPTISM: The doctrine set forth in Holy Scripture, and taught in the Evangelical Lutheran Church. By *Charles P. Krauth, D. D.* Gettysburg. 1866. pp. 73.

This pamphlet, the contents of which were first published in the "Evangelical Review," sets forth the Lutheran view of Baptism from Luther, the Lutheran confessions and Lutheran theologians. Dr. Krauth writes clearly and forcibly, and we have read this little work with interest. We would prefer if, in setting forth at the close the *Calvinistic* view, which he gives correctly, he had not made it cover the Reformed view—this last is a wider conception. In that case he would have quoted the Heidelberg Catechism also. We cannot now review the work, which, if we did, we would find much to commend and less to differ from.

HISTORY, NATURE AND BENEFITS OF LITURGICAL WORSHIP. By Rev. *J. H. Wagner.* pp. 40.

This is a sermon delivered by appointment before the Classis of Westmoreland, Sept. 23d, 1866, and has been published by the Classis. It is based on 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 16. The discourse gives evidence of careful preparation, and is a compact, full and able discussion of liturgical worship in all its aspects. Its excellency furnishes the reason for its publication by Classis. It cannot fail to do good wherever it is circulated and read.

GOD'S WORD WRITTEN: The Doctrine of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture explained and enforced. By the Rev. Edward Garbett, M. A., Boyle Lecturer, &c., Select Preacher to the University of Oxford, &c., American Tract Society, Boston. Pp. 358. For sale by Broughton and Wyman, No. 13 Bible House, New York.

This book, first published by the London Religious Tract Society, now finds its way to the readers of the New World, through the press of the American Tract Society. The author's object is, as we learn from the preface, "to explain, and in explaining to enforce, the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of Holy Scripture." The subject is treated in an able manner, and the careful reader will not fail to find the perusal of this book both pleasant and profitable. Its plan is simple, and perhaps somewhat novel. The author pursues the inductive method, basing his arguments on facts, and from facts ascending to principles. True, there are occasional expressions which we could

wish to have omitted or modified, but taken as a whole, we hesitate not to recommend it to all, who would store their minds with useful knowledge in regard to the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. The two chapters on the "Divine and Human Elements" of Scripture in relation to each other are especially interesting. So is also the chapter on "Verbal Inspiration." In order to be properly understood and appreciated, however, the whole work must be read and pondered.

The style being simple and vigorous and the discussion clear, none will consider this book dry or dull. Every page leads attractively on to the succeeding one, and we follow argument after argument well pleased, and rejoicing in this additional contribution to the cause of Truth in the world.

Let those who hesitate to receive the Bible as the Inspired Word of God read it. It will help to remove their seemingly insuperable difficulties, and to clear up points which now cast gloomy doubts over their minds.

"God's Word Written," is a work, which, like "Life and Death Eternal," we should like to see in the hands of every one, well knowing that such books counteract successfully the efforts of infidels to lead astray believers, by trying to perplex and embarrass them. It furnishes an excellent means of Defence against the weapons which modern skeptics have drawn afresh from the armory of Satan to assail the Word of God.

It is a neat book—got up in fine style—clean white paper—large clear type—and has a pleasantness to the eye which is refreshing.

L.

The Child's Catechism; containing a Lesson for every Sunday in the year; with Prayers for little Children. The whole adapted to the use of Families and Sunday-schools. By *H. Harbaugh, D. D.* Philadelphia. S. R. Fisher & Co. pp. 72.

This catechism was first published some years ago, and a large edition of it sold. The edition having run out, it was not designed to republish it. A number of pastors, however, were pleased to say, that they found it exactly adapted to use in their Sunday-schools, and so urged its publication. It has accordingly been carefully revised and stereotyped. Of its merits we have nothing to say. We regard it as orthodox as we do ourself. As to its adaptation to Sunday-school instruction, we invite pastors and parents to examine it, and decide for themselves. It is neatly gotten up, and bound in stiff covers.

Sunday-school Books published by Skelly & Co.

In the July No. we noticed a number of the publications of J. P. Skelly & Co. We found them mostly of a better tone than the generality of books published for Sunday-schools. They seem to move more in the element of the Church, than our Sunday-school literature generally does, and from some allusions to the holy-days of the Church-year, we would judge them to be mostly republications of

English works. In this we may be mistaken. At any rate we have found fewer objectionable books among those, and a larger number which can be recommended to our Sunday-schools, than in any other list of similar publications We cannot go into a detailed notice of the list now before us, but judging from a number of those which we have carefully read, we feel free to advise our Sunday schools to examine the publications of J. P. Skelly & Co. We believe them as a whole decidedly better adapted to our Sunday-schools than any others. At least we believe proper judges would find a large number to suit their wants.

We give the titles of the books on our table.

I. HENRY MORGAN; or the Sower and the Seed. By *H. M.* pp. 102.

This is the author of the "Red Velvet Bible," noticed in the July number, a book which ignores the Church wholly. This one we have not had time to read.

II. THE CABIN IN THE BRUSH. 1867. pp. 249.

This book contains an account of the wicked and wretched inhabitants in the Brush, "a region of country forming a portion of southwestern Missouri, and stretching down into Arkansas." A sad story of worse than paganism in the bounds of the United States! Such festering boils in the body of our western and southwestern communities cannot too soon be lanced, that their full corruption may run out, be seen, and the remedy of Christianity applied.

III. GEORGE WAYLAND, the little Medicine Carrier. 1867. pp. 105.

IV. DONALD'S HAMPER. 1867. pp. 86.

V. LITTLE JOE and his Strawberry Plant. 1867. pp. 85.

VI. MARY MANSFIELD; or no Time to be a Christian. pp. 102.

These books are all beautifully gotten up by Skelly & Co. The paper binding, and typography are faultless.

ADDRESS delivered at Paoli Massacre Grounds, July 4th, 1867. By *J. J. Criegh, Esq.*

An eloquent and patriotic address gathering up and presenting some important principles and lessons from the past history of the American nation.

3 1198 04015 0984
N/1198/04015/0984X

UNIVERSITY
of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

3 1198 04015 0984
N/1198/04015/0984X